

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1855.

---

ART. I. — *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, depuis son Origine jusqu'à nos Jours. Par J. DE HAMMER. Traduit de l'Allemand sur les Notes et sous la Direction de l'Auteur. Par J.J. HELLERT.* 18 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1835—1843.

THE Ottomans were the last of those conquering races who, during the middle ages, broke into Europe, and fixed the present arrangement of its map; and the Ottoman State may be said to be, with one partial exception, the last great territorial conquest made in Europe. Never assimilating to those whom they had conquered, and but imperfectly able to incorporate their subjects with themselves, divided by what seems an eternal bar from the fellowship of other European nations, the Ottomans, in the period of their prosperity and strength, afflicted Europe with incessant and singularly terrible warfare; and long after they had learned not to be ambitious, insulted it with their domestic ferocity and untamed barbarian pride. The curse which they had brought with them clings to their presence still, in the hour of their deep decay. By the very decline of their power, jealousies have been awakened which could not be appeased, and questions raised which could not be solved, without plunging Europe into a war, of which no one can forecast the issues. At a moment like the present,<sup>1</sup> when, while verging to their fall, they have once more become the occasion of calamity to Christendom, it may not be without interest to recal briefly the steps by which they arose from the most insignificant beginnings to their eventful eminence.

The history of the early Ottomans has been very imperfectly told, and much still remains dark and uncertain in the features which distinguish in its origin that strange and mighty race from its kindred tribes. It is a history, in the main, of wasteful and unscrupulous conquest, like that of other successful barbarians of Europe and Asia. But we seem to discern, even

<sup>1</sup> The following pages were in type in December 1854.

from the beginning, some points of special interest. We seem to perceive in it the remarkable history of a single family, gradually gathering round itself the materials of a vast ambition, and shaping a people and a nation to support it, out of heterogeneous elements, by the informing power and spirit of one household and line. It is an advance of which the earlier steps were as slow and gradual as its subsequent strides suddenly became gigantic. It is a story of great patience and resolution; of an ambition, which, unlike that of most barbarians, was not in a hurry, but could keep its object in view and devise the means for its achievement without restlessness and without weariness. It was content to work by degrees, and, without losing sight of the highest prizes, was satisfied with smaller ones, while they were proportionate to its strength. And among the institutions of which the foundations were early laid, as the permanent supports of the greatness which it meditated, one was at once the most original, the most terrible, and, for the time, the most effective that is to be found recorded among the inventions of deep craft and heartless love of power, of which history is full. The Ottomans found the art of borrowing their strength systematically, and from the very first, from the races they were subduing; of forcing into their own service, and moulding to their own purpose, the promise and energy which was their natural antagonist. Their history is one at first of few disasters, so cautious and so steadily provident, even while they were most enterprising, were these builders of a new empire. A reverse did come at length, unexpected and crushing. It retarded for some score of years their ambition; but it neither broke up their institutions, nor dismayed their spirit, nor turned aside their purposes, nor in the end crippled their power. It is a painful, but it is an instructive lesson, to compare their stout and persevering course, so wisely compliant to circumstances, but so inflexible in its ultimate direction, their imperious and exacting urgency in the opportunities of success, their self-restraint when it was the time to wait or pause, with the shortsightedness, the despair, the worn-out and spiritless imbecility, the random efforts, of those whom they were menacing. Thus, at length, Christianity was beaten down, the remains of ancient civilization swept away, and the seed and promise of that to come destroyed, not by a passing burst of barbarian ravage, but by a polity new and uncongenial to Europe, which had early attained its maturity and secured its permanence; religious in its groundwork of ideas and laws, with a religion bitterly hostile to all that is sacred in Europe; purely and fixedly military, in its organization and aims, as well as its spirit and habits. No glimmering of political life or thought, no dim image of civil



rights or duties, ever gave hope, while the Ottomans were rising to greatness, that they would gradually open, from the tastes and tempers of their ancestral deserts, to the gentler manners, the wider thoughts, the nobler pursuits, the wiser and more equal laws, by which alone nations can be preserved from corruption and decay. There was no germ of improvement in their institutions; yet they succeeded in raising on those institutions a great monarchy, which with all its inherent seeds of ruin, has already stood the wear of four centuries.

In the following pages we shall confine ourselves to that period of their history during which they were preparing for their future greatness,—the period from their first appearance on the outskirts of the Greek empire, till they felt themselves ready to take the great step, for which they had so steadily been preparing, and claim the imperial city, round whose walls they had been closing for more than a century. Our chief guide, as he probably must be of most who study Ottoman history for some time to come, will be Von Hammer. His diffuse and ponderous, yet noble work, is the production of a scholar, a diplomatist, and a traveller, who for thirty years prepared himself for his task by an unwearied study, both of the people whose history he meant to write, and of the original monuments of that history. None but he has yet examined, systematically and critically, the Ottoman records. He ransacked the libraries of Europe from Naples to Oxford; he was able to command the use of the archives of those powers which had most connexion with the Porte, at Vienna and Venice; his agents searched for manuscripts in Cairo and Bagdad, Aleppo and Damascus. Of his absolute success, few probably in the West can be competent to judge; and few are likely to qualify themselves for testing his accuracy, by invading once more that strange mass of semi-barbarous literature, Turkish, Persian, Arabic, only existing in manuscript, and dispersed in distant libraries, from which he drew his materials. We must take on trust his reports of Turkish authorities. In the early part of the history, though they are not absolutely wanting, they furnish, even according to his estimate of them, but scanty and uncertain light: but it is all we have, to check the evidence, perhaps even less to be relied on, of the Greeks. But it is necessary, in accepting the testimony of Ottoman historians,<sup>1</sup> to remember the criticism of Seadeddin, one of the

<sup>1</sup> The earliest sources of Ottoman history to which Von Hammer could get access in the originals, and which he used, are as follows:—

1. The History of *Aaschik-Paschazade*. The writer was a witness of Amurath II.'s Hungarian war in 1438 (*Von Hammer*, i. 345, and *infra*, p. 294), and wrote under Bajazet II., the son of Mahomet the Conqueror, (1481—1512.) He 'drew materials from the Book of Sheikh Yachshi, the Imam of Sultan Orchan, (1325—1359,) (one of the seven who attended Othman's death-bed, *Von Hammer*, i. 86,) who relates

most famous of their number, on his predecessor, Idris, whose 'Eight Paradises' he eulogizes and copies, but of whom he remarks, 'that he is too concise in enumerating the virtues of the Ottomans, and does not set forth, with the copiousness and 'particularity which they deserve, the praises of the Sultans.' Yet the historian, whose almost only fault is said to be the niggardness of his eulogy, opens his work with claiming it as his merit, that all that is not to the credit of his race, he is most careful to pass over in silence, and that he will only admit posterity to the knowledge of the noble deeds of the house of Othman. It is a partial compensation that his standard of the blameworthy and the honourable is an eastern one; and he records without a remark, and of course without a shadow of censure, the murder of an aged uncle, who was pleading against an aggressive war with the Christians, by the first founder of the race.

We have prefixed to this article the French translation of Von Hammer, to have the opportunity of giving the caution, that it is not to be trusted. It is to be regretted that this handsome and complete book, which contains at full length all Von Hammer's illustrative extracts and documents, and a useful atlas of maps and plans, should have been prepared, as far as the translator's work is concerned, with such inexcusable ignorance

---

the earliest events of Ottoman history from the mouth of his father.' It was a forgotten book to the Ottomans in the 17th century. Von Hammer searched for it in vain at Constantinople; but found it, and made extracts from it, in the Vatican.

2. An old chronicle, by Ali Osman, reaching down to 1470. It had been brought to Europe by Veranzius, and used by Leunclavius.

3. 'View of the World,' by *Neschri*, a contemporary of Aashik-Paschazade under Bajazet II. 'Written in rough Turkish; simply and without art.' Also used by Leunclavius.

4. The 'Eight Paradises' of *Idris* of Bitlis, who died 1523, and who, at the instance of Bajazet II., wrote in Persian the first Ottoman history with attention to elegance of style. Seaddedin regrets in him his extreme luxuriance of diction. What that must have been, may be imagined, from the *soberer* critic's language, who describes the work as 'veiled in musk;' as 'a resplendent beauty among all the brides of the library,' whose 'musk-perfumed hair, that is, the interlacing lines of its letters, is like the locks of the Houris,' and 'whose face is painted with vermillion, that is, it is plentifully interspersed with the texts of the Koran written in red ink.' Von Hammer procured it with difficulty.

5. History of *Lutfi-Pascha*, down to 1553. He had been Grand Vizier.

6. History of *Djemali*, down to 1550. Brought to Vienna in 1551, and translated by Leunclavius. 'The first trustworthy foundation of Ottoman history in Europe.'

7. 'The Crown of Histories' of *Seaddedin*, the first official historiographer of the Ottoman sultans, under Amurath III. (1574-95.) Seaddedin was tutor to the princes, judge of the army, and at last Mufi. Translated, but carelessly, by Bratutti.

8. History of *Ali*, to 1597, 'uncritical, but painstaking and impartial, and not written in an official spirit.'

Thus the earliest Turkish historian cited by Von Hammer wrote after the Conquest. With these materials in his hands, instead of in those of Cantemir, we feel our footing more secure; but, after all, Gibbon's remark about Cantemir involuntarily recurs, that 'he gives a miserable idea of his Turkish guides.'

or negligence. The continual and stupid mistakes which recur in this neat and flowery French version of Von Hammer's ungainly but vigorous German, negative, to our mind, the assertion in the title-page, that it was translated 'under the direction of the author.' We cannot doubt that Von Hammer understood French. We are certain that the French which is put in his mouth by his translator, working, as he says, 'under his direction,' makes him perpetually say the exact opposite of what he says himself, in German.<sup>1</sup>

The traveller in Asia Minor comes from time to time upon encampments of Turkomans, such as have for the last 1,000 years roamed with their horses and their flocks over the provinces of the East. These wandering shepherds still adhere to the life which their fathers led, in the steppes and highlands of Central Asia. They pitch their black tents in the plains and near the cities during the winter; as the summer draws on, they retire to the coolness and fresh springs of the mountain pastures. They can live contented with this vagrant liberty; but they are ever ready to mount and ride, at a moment's warning, to any call to pillage and war. Such a tribe, dangerous or harmless, or merely troublesome, according to the character of its chiefs, was roaming, towards the middle of the 13th century, in the north-western corner of Asia Minor, by the banks of the Sangarius and among the oak forests of the Bithynian Olympus; one, and an inconsiderable one, among the many tribes of the same race, who had fixed their tents, and some of them their thrones, in that fair but wasted land. This encampment of shepherds and freebooters was the germ of the Ottoman Empire.

It was but the fragment of a small Turkoman horde, which towards the beginning of the century,—among the many migrations and changes caused among the wandering races of Asia by the devastations of Genghis Khan,—had left its seats in Khorasan, which lay in the track of the Mongol invasions, to seek safer and remoter pasture grounds by the sources of the Euphrates. They seem to have wandered down the course of the river, to the neighbourhood of Aleppo, till, on the death of Genghis Khan, they again turned their faces eastward, towards their old abodes; but as the tribe was crossing the Euphrates, the horse of their leader, Suleiman Schah, stumbled from the steep bank, and his rider was drowned in the stream, at a spot which still keeps the name of the 'Turk's Grave.' This broke up the camp. Suleiman left four sons. Two of them continued their course eastward, and with the majority of the tribe, their posterity have been lost among the nomad hordes into which

<sup>1</sup> In our references to Von Hammer, we cite, unless the contrary is expressed, from the second German edition. (Pesth, 1834.)

they melted. The other two, Ertoghrul and his brother Dundar, with but 400 families, turned once more to the west, to become the founders of the mighty and terrible house of Othman.

At that time, the nominal masters of Asia Minor were the Turkoman Sultans of the family of Seljouk, who ruled at Iconium. Their protection was sought by their humbler kinsmen under Ertoghrul. The story goes, that in the journeyings of Ertoghrul and his tribe, they came upon a battle-field, where a fight was going on between two unequally matched armies. Ertoghrul could not resist the temptation to join in the fray; and, as he was a lover of justice and equity, resolved, while yet at a distance, and not knowing who were the combatants, to assist the weaker side. He found, after his horsemen had decided the battle, that he had helped the Sultan of Iconium, the great Alaeddin, against an overpowering force of Mongols. But with his ready hand, and love of fair play, Ertoghrul's ambition and desire was only for the retirement and peace of an unmolested pastoral life. He asked for no reward from the Sultan, but to be allowed to feed his flocks in some safe and secluded district; and Alaeddin assigned him the Black Mountain near Angora. Such was the account which the servants of the house of Othman delivered to its chroniclers, as what they had heard from the elders of the tribe, respecting the first occasion of the close alliance between their chiefs and the Seljoukian Sultans. But the retired pasture grounds of the Black Mountain were in time exchanged for a more public scene of life, which tempted and favoured more aspiring desires, and more stirring adventure.

In the decline of the Eastern Empire, its Asiatic border had gradually shrunk back before the Persians, the Arabs, and the Seljouks, from the Euphrates, to the south-eastern horizon of Constantinople, the Bithynian hills. The river Sangarius, with its chain of forts, and the passes of Olympus behind it, which covered the frontier, and fenced in the green and wooded plain which was spread round the walls of Nicomedia and Nicea, had more than once been forced by the invaders, and Bithynia with its royal cities lost and regained, in the vicissitudes of border war. Bithynia was now a province of the Byzantine empire, the last that remained to it on the other side of the Bosphorus; and the outlying fringe of plain that extends beyond its mountain border, from the *eastern* slopes of Olympus to the banks of the Sangarius and the Thymbres, was a debateable ground, occupied and fought over both by Greeks and Seljouks. Here Alaeddin settled Ertoghrul and his horde, as an advanced camp, to guard the outskirts of his dominions, and annoy those of his Christian neighbours. He could not

have chosen a more efficient garrison. In the wasted and depopulated plain, and the extensive river banks, and in the cool summits and uplands of the neighbouring hills, the flocks of the tribe found ample and congenial range for their winter and summer wanderings; and its rapid and active horsemen were not more ready to defend their new pasture grounds, than they were to challenge the risks and excitement of border frays and plunder. They were skilfully and resolutely led: and a great trial of strength and cunning with the Greek borderers and their hired Tartar allies, established Ertoghrul's name, and his claim to the confidence of Alaeddin. In the front of the battle rode a crowd of light-armed skirmishers, whose name, the *Akindji*, became in later times but too familiar to the Christians of Hungary and Germany, as the name of the irregular bands, who preceded the march of the Ottoman hosts, and whose furious onset was the signal of battle. Behind their cover came the main array, the 444 companions of Ertoghrul, (Turkish tradition, which delights in combinations of the number *four*, has preserved the exact number,) which helped Alaeddin when he was overpowered by the Mongols. For three days and three nights the battle lasted; it began in the defiles of Olympus, crossed the mountain, and descended into the plain of Brusa; but in the end Ertoghrul broke and trampled down his enemies, and chased them through the plain, to the edge of the sea. Alaeddin had waited anxiously for the news; and in memory of the victory, and of the fiery horsemen of the vanguard, he called the name of the district which he had given to Ertoghrul, *Sultan Ēni*, the *Sultan's Fore-front*. *Sultan Ēni*—which still keeps the name, as a Sandjak or fief of the Ottoman empire—was the first land which the founders of that empire could call their own—the first foothold, from which they advanced, step by step, to the conquest of half the Roman dominion. In the narrow canton of *Sultan Ēni* are found the first local names of Ottoman history, made to the nation venerable by their association with the abodes, the fortunes, the graves of its patriarchs, heroes, martyrs. Here are found the scenes of their birth, their combats, their loves, their councils. Here is still seen the village where the Cilician wife of Othman, long wooed and hardly won, spent her maiden years, with her aged father, the venerable Scheikh Edebali. And here by the roadside, the ancient domed tomb among the cypresses on the hill, of the Turkoman leader, whose children have arrogated to themselves a place above all other earthly thrones, is visited by Mahometan pilgrims with pride and devotion, near the hamlet where he ruled.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The village of *Shughut*, or *Sogud*, near the Sangarius. Leake's *Asia Minor*, p. 15; Von Hammer, i. 64.

There was nothing in the achievements of Ertoghrlul and his camp to portend the greatness which his children were to reach. A remarkable contrast to the rise of most Asiatic empires, which, like those of Genghis and Timour, often grew to their colossal and terrific power in the life of one generation, the Ottomans advanced steadily, but at first almost imperceptibly. The Ottoman legends relate the dream of Ertoghrlul, who had sought hospitality in the house of a holy dervish; and after he had stood all night long, reading the Koran, fell asleep, and in the dreams of morning, the time when dreams are divine, received the promise, that as he had honoured the Eternal Word that night by his devout watching, his children should be had to honour throughout all generations. But all that had been granted to Ertoghrlul, at the end of a life of nearly a century, was but a wasted and narrow border tract, with its ruined villages and lonely hills; and Othman, his greater and more restless son, though he turned the thoughts of his tribe towards wider conquests, and though from him a nation and its name, new in history, had its beginning, yet had barely, at the end of his threescore years and ten, made himself master of half a small and feebly defended province.

The accounts of Othman's life pass insensibly from legends to history.<sup>1</sup> They begin with the patriarchal simplicity and romantic adventures of a chieftain of the desert: they end with the first rude outlines of the founder of a dynasty, and the territorial prince. But even the legendary part of his history—the stories of his marriage, his friendships, and the marriage of his son—exhibit, as it were in rudiment and figure, some of the most characteristic features of what was afterwards the policy of his race. Othman wooed and won a foreign wife to be the mother of his children. Besides his Tartar brethren and comrades, the 'Alps,' whose names are joined with his in the story of his wars, he sought beyond the camp the friendship of two sorts of men. The counsellors whom he venerated, whose sanction he sought for in all his plans, whose abodes he visited with reverent humility, and for whom lands and houses were largely and solemnly set apart in all his conquests, were the Scheikhs and dervishes, the learned and holy men of Islam. For his most daring and zealous captain, he had won over from his race and his faith, a Christian apostate. And as he had himself married out of his own race, so the legends tell us, how he

<sup>1</sup> The names of *Othman*, *Bajazet*, *Amurath*, *Mahomet*, are so naturalized in our language, that incorrect, and needlessly incorrect as they are, it is hardly worth while, at least in a paper like the present, and speaking of certain well-known historical persons, to replace them with *Osman*, *Bayazid*, *Murad*, *Mohammed*, or *Mahmoud*. It is too late to change, in general use, the familiar *Ottomans* for the more accurate *Osmans* or *Osmanni*; just as it would be to introduce the native forms of the names of Lyons, Leghorn, Naples, Florence.



laid in wait for and carried off into captivity a Christian damsel, to be the wife of his young son. We see already a foreshadowing of the domestic and administrative usages of the Ottoman house — its mixture of foreign blood, its slave marriages, its array of viziers and generals, torn away or allured from the choicest youth of surrounding Christendom; and a fierce military spirit, and institutions adapted only for war, intimately allying themselves with a religious element, and owning their only control in its ministers.

Othman had long to wait, and much to endure, before he could win the wife whom he had chosen, Malchatoun, the daughter of Edebali, a holy man, who had wandered from his birth-place in Cilicia among many cities of Islam, and had at last chosen for the resting-place of his old age, a village in Bithynia. Othman's love was passionate and strong. He visited with assiduous and humble reverence the threshold of the venerable Scheikh. But difficulties and dangers met and sorely tried him. Edebali refused to give his only daughter. Othman had a rival in the Greek chief of Dorylaeum, who assembled his friends, and laid wait for Othman's life. Othman, indeed, slew his treacherous enemy, and gained, in the affray, his trustiest friend, Michael 'of the pointed beard,' one of the companions of the Greek captain; who, after having been vanquished and disarmed by Othman, was so struck with admiration of his conqueror, that he devoted himself to his service, and at last forsook for his sake creed and country, and became the ever ready assailant of his own people; the first of that long line of Christian renegades, who have been in every age the fiercest and the most terrible servants of the Ottoman power. But Malchatoun had yet to be won; and it required a dream sent from heaven, to overcome the scruples or fears of Edebali. Othman, in spite of the old man's discouraging words, waited, resigned and patient, under his roof, still reverently listening to his wisdom, still hoping in his own perseverance and fortune. One night he had a dream, such as is accustomed to be related of the founders of Oriental empires. He saw the full moon rise from the bosom of Edebali, and descend into his own; and from thence he saw a stately tree arise, which grew taller and more spreading, till it overshadowed the world. Beneath it arose four of the great mountains of the earth, Caucasus and Atlas, Taurus and Hæmus. From its roots issued four mighty rivers, the Danube, the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile. Beautiful gardens and stately palaces were spread under its branches, with minarets, from whence the call to prayer blended with songs of nightingales, and the prattle of many coloured parrots. At length a strong wind bent the branches, the leaves lengthened out into the form of pointed sabres, which

turned to the chief cities of the world, and at last to Constantinople. Constantinople, between two continents and two seas, seemed like a diamond set between two sapphires and two emeralds—the jewel of a royal ring. Othman was about to put it on his finger when he awoke. A century and a half were to elapse before the promise of the dream was fulfilled. But it won Othman his wife, the predestined mother of a line of mighty kings, the last and the longest of the royal races of Islam.

For his son also, Orchan, he sought a wife of fairer beauty and higher blood, than could be found in the black tents of his wandering brethren. The early legends tell of alliances as well as feuds between the camp of the Turkomans and the Greeks of the towns. Ertoghrol and Othman had formed an alliance with the captain of the castle of Belecama—an alliance marked by a curious mixture of confidence and mistrust. When the Turkomans drove their flocks to the hills in summer, they left the more cumbrous portion of their possessions in charge of the captain of Belecama; but the compact was that the Turkoman treasures were to be brought into the Greek town, by none but the women and children of the tribe. For many years the agreement was faithfully kept. The Turkomans missed nothing at the hands of the Greek captain; and Othman, when he came down to the plains in winter, brought presents of cheese and honey, of horse trappings and carpets of goats' hair—the labours of the summer months on Olympus,—for his Christian ally. But, at last, say the Turkish chroniclers, the Greek grew jealous of Othman's power, and leagued against him. Othman was invited to the marriage feast of the captain of Belecama, where the Greeks were prepared to seize him. Michael 'of the pointed beard,' whom the Greeks had in vain endeavoured to gain over to the conspiracy, warned Othman of his danger. Then he resolved on swift and signal revenge. He said he would be present at the nuptials. But as summer was at hand, and he was going up into the hills, he requested the bridegroom, the captain of Belecama, to take charge as usual of the treasures of the tribe for the summer months, and to admit the women who bore them into the town. The gates were opened without suspicion; but this time, under the long veils and mantles came forty stout warriors, Othman and thirty-nine companions. The captain with his retinue was absent, preparing for his wedding on the following day, with the beautiful daughter of the chief of a neighbouring Greek town. Othman seized Belecama, and then went off to waylay its master and the bridal procession, as they passed through a gorge in the hills on their road homeward. The surprise was successful. The bridegroom was slain; and his Greek bride, the 'Lotus-flower' of

Brusa, was swept off by the Turkoman robbers to their lair, to become the spouse of their leader's son, Orkhan.

But as the power of Othman grew, notices precise and circumstantial, with dates and names, appear by the side of these tales of desert life and border adventure. The year is recorded, and the place, in which Othman was raised from the head of a wandering camp, into a recognised Emir, or vassal of the Seljouk empire; and again, the date, when, after the Seljouk empire had fallen to pieces, Othman could call himself an independent prince, and began his struggle for conquest and pre-eminence with the other Turkish chiefs, most of them more powerful than himself, who had shared among themselves the heritage of Alp-Arslan in Asia Minor.<sup>1</sup> In 1289 Othman had seized a Greek town at the edge of that plain of Dorylæum, where he had long kept guard for the Seljouk frontier. The sultan of the expiring dynasty of Iconium rewarded the exploit of the rising border chief with the dignity of an Emir or Prince; and the 'Black Castle' (*Karadja Hissar*) on the Thymbres, deserves remembrance in history, as the place where the ancestors of Mahomet the Conqueror, and Soliman the Magnificent, ceased to be private men, and exchanged their rude preeminence for an acknowledged place among the lords of their people. The flag, the kettledrum, and the hostetail, the insignia of his new rank, were solemnly delivered to Othman, by the messenger of his feudal superior, the Iconian Sultan. Othman received them amid the clanging salute of barbaric music, with his arms reverently crossed on his bosom. And long afterwards, in remembrance of the investiture of the Emir of *Karadja Hissar*, his proud successors stood in the same attitude, when the trumpets and cymbals of the host sounded forth at the hour of prayer, till Mahomet the Conqueror thought it time to abolish the memento of his forefather's dependence, and rise to greatness, with the observation, 'that forms of reverence which have lasted 200 years, have lasted too long.'

At *Karadja Hissar*, the seat of his new government, Othman established a weekly market, according to a custom still characteristic of the Turkomans,<sup>2</sup> with its overseers, and a tribunal,

<sup>1</sup> The *Ten States*, mostly named after their first chiefs, were, on the *Ægean*, *Karasi*, in Mysia, *Saruchan*, in the Valley of the *Hermus*, *Aidin*, at Smyrna on the *Mæander*, *Mentesche*, in Caria, *Tekkeh*, in Lycia: the Midland States, *Kermian* and *Hamid*, in Phrygia and Pisidia: on the North Coast, *Kastemuni*, at Sinope and in Paphlagonia: in the South-east, the most powerful of all, inheriting the Seljouk capital, Iconium, and holding the approaches from Persia and Syria, the *Karamans*: lastly, the *Ottomans*, in Bithynia.

<sup>2</sup> Burnes' *Travels*, ii. p. 225.; iii. p. 7. Probably a fairly correct idea may be formed of the life of Othman's tribe, balancing between a camp and a fixed village—of their religious temper, their forays, their relations with their neighbours, from Burnes' account of the Turkomans of *Shurukhs*, on the border between

which became famous through the neighbourhood for its justice and impartiality. He turned the church into a mosque; and to the mosque he appointed the ministers of public prayer and preaching, and the judicial expounder of the religious and civil law. But he did not do this before he had first consulted the Elders of his camp and the holy Sheikh Edebali, by whose words he was guided, and till, by their advice, he had sought and obtained the sanction of his liege lord. But the Seljouk power was fast hastening to its ruin. For ten years only after the Sultan of Iconium had invested Othman with the rank of a vassal Emir, was the name of the last Alaeddin named, as his sovereign and liege lord, in the public prayer of Othman's town.<sup>1</sup> In the last year but one of the thirteenth century, Alaeddin's name was changed in the prayer which was said in the Mosque of Karadja Hissar, for that of Othman. And from this era, the opening of the fourteenth century, so famous in the religion and the poetry of the West, no other name but that of their own princes has been heard in the Friday worship within the Ottoman dominions. The Mahometan historians remark that the opening of each of the centuries of their era, which at that epoch nearly corresponded with the division of those of our own,<sup>2</sup> had been marked, up to the time of Othman, by the appearance of some renowned and mighty prince. The Prophet himself—the founder of the Omniades—the great Caliph Al-Mamun—the first of the Fatimites in Egypt—the last of the great Abbasides—and lastly, the devastator of the world, Genghis Khan, ‘stand like colossal figures, in the portal, each of his century.’ At the threshold of the eighth, stands a name, after the Prophet, the mightiest of all, that of the founder of the Ottomans.

Yet a traveller could easily traverse in a day the dominions over which Othman first exercised independent sway. He was now, however, a sovereign prince, and he distributed the towns and hamlets of his principality among his companions and coun-

the Turkoman Khan of Orgunje, the strongest of these robber-chiefs, and the polished, but unwarlike empire of Persia. The tribe claimed kindred with the Osmanli of Constantinople. Around an old fort, were grouped the permanent huts of the Jews and traders, and the movable houses of the Turkomana. Their customs in courtship and marriage, in which the lover carries off his bride on horseback, accord with what the legend relates of Othman, but would startle his descendants. Burnes, vol. iii. ch. xii.—xv.

<sup>1</sup> A Mahometan ruler is known as an independent sovereign by two tokens:—1, when he coins money in his own name; 2, when the solemn Friday prayer is said in his name.

<sup>2</sup> It need perhaps hardly be observed, that the Mahometan years consist of *lunar* months; so that the years of *their* centuries gain on the years of *ours*. The beginning of the 8th century from the Hegira thus nearly coincided with the beginning of the 14th century of our era. The remark is more characteristic than accurate.

sellors.. And he himself, from the summits of Olympus, cast his eyes westward to the rich plains and fenced cities of Bithynia. The storm was not long in coming. A solemn council was held to deliberate whether Othman and his companions should try to add to their conquests. Dundar, his uncle, a patriarch of ninety years, who had come with Ertoghrlul from the banks of the Euphrates, counselled peace. Othman's answer was an arrow in the heart of his father's brother; and thus, his resolution, sealed with the blood of a kinsman, was taken and confirmed to go forth and conquer.

The invaders found little to resist them, except the stone walls of the great cities. There was a time when the Greek Emperors had found no difficulty in beating back the inroads of freebooters, of the same race and hardihood as Othman's horsemen, who since the days of Alp Arslan had harassed the Bithynian frontier. Besides the regular armies, who waged war with varying success, the passes of Olympus and the villages of Bithynia had been given in charge to a stout and warlike race of borderers, who enjoyed great privileges, were proprietors of the land which they guarded, and were exempt from the oppressive taxes of the empire, on condition of being responsible for the safety of its limits. These free mountaineers 'formed a bold and active militia, which garrisoned a line of forts that commanded all the roads, bridges, and mountain passes;' and for a long time the bowmen of Nicæa were the most renowned soldiers of the Greek armies.<sup>1</sup> But about the time that Othman was born, the last and worst of the Greek dynasties mounted the throne. Michael, the usurper of an empire, which the Latins and the barbarians had left shattered and prostrate, yet stronger than any of its neighbours, had neither the virtue nor the genius to restore it; and a Greek courtier of the time declares, 'that he systematically weakened the Greek population from his fear of rebellion.' Among his measures was the destruction of the spirited and wealthy race who had so long and so effectually garrisoned the Bithynian frontier. By war and by confiscation, 'the resources of this flourishing province,' says Mr. Finlay, 'were ruined, and its population was so diminished, that when the Ottoman Turks attacked the Empire, the renowned archers of Bithynia, and the mountain militia had ceased to exist.'<sup>2</sup> Some of these, like Michael 'of the pointed beard,' the captain of one of the strongholds on Olympus, had carried

<sup>1</sup> Finlay, ii. pp. 411, 418.

<sup>2</sup> See Gibbon, viii. 56; Finlay, ii. 445; Von Hammer, i. 79.

their valour and their local knowledge over to the camp of the invaders. The Turks of Othman, like the bands of their countrymen on every coast of the Empire, rode and ravaged at will. Near Nicomedia, the mercenaries, who formed the Emperor's body-guard, met Othman in the open field; but they left the victory and the ripening harvest to the spoilers. Othman now knew his strength; and the plains of Bithynia had no longer any rest from the hoofs of his cavalry, nor its towns and fortified posts any security from the daring of his warriors. They were masters of the open country between Olympus and the sea; they rode unchallenged by the banks of the Bosphorus and on the shores of the Euxine; and they riveted their hold on a land which they were too few to occupy, by getting into their hands, one by one, a network of strongholds or considerable villages, which were distributed by a kind of feudal tenure among the companions of Othman. But there still remained the large cities, whose massive walls and guarded gates, the Turkish horsemen had not skill to approach, nor artillery to batter; and probably their numbers were too small to risk the losses of a storm.<sup>1</sup> But if Othman had no engineers or battering rams, he had that resolute patience which has so often marked his race. He had waited patiently when he wooed his wife; he had time before him, and could wait patiently for conquest. In front of Nicæa he occupied two small forts, from whence he resolved to keep guard on the harassed city, till weariness or chance gave the besiegers their prey. At Brusa he did the same. The posts in the neighbourhood were successively mastered by force or treachery; the Turks closed in on all sides till they had entrenched themselves within view of the outlets of the city; and for ten years they watched patiently, and apparently without giving or receiving disturbance, at the very gates of Brusa. At last the constraint became intolerable; when all hopes of relief were vain, the inhabitants, through the mediation of the renegade Michael, bought off their lives and a safe departure, at the price of their city, and the sum of 30,000 ducats; a sum which became in after times,—it is said from the precedent of the ransom of this

<sup>1</sup> "These Toorkmuns had made their descent near Meshid four days previously, about ten in the morning, and rode up to the very walls of the city, driving men and animals before them. Not a soul appeared to resist their progress. . . While we admire the courage of these men, what shall we think of the Persians, who are encamped within two days journey of Meshid, under the heir-apparent of the throne, and numbering an army of 20,000 men? . . . One wonders that human beings would consent to live in such a spot. The circle of villages round Meshid gets more circumscribed yearly, and in the one which we first entered, every field had its tower, built by the cultivator, as a defence to which he might fly on seeing the approach of a Toorkmun."—Burnes, iii. 54—64.

But the Turks of Othman ravaged with a purpose.



first captured city,—the regular amount of the annual tribute, exacted from neighbouring Christian states as the price of peace, by the Ottoman Sultans. The Greek captain of Brusa, like Michael 'of the pointed beard,' threw in his lot with the conquerors and adopted their faith, and under the name of Evrenos, became in after times one of the most-renowned of the chiefs who led the Ottoman hosts into Europe.

Thus a capital was won for Othman, more worthy of the founder of a dynasty, than the petty villages in which he had hitherto held his residence; and the beautiful city at the foot of Olympus became from henceforth, to the house of Othman, their chosen abode in life and resting-place in death, till in time it was exchanged for a still more magnificent and imperial site for their palaces and their tombs. It was won before Othman's death, but his eyes were not to see it. Othman was on his death bed, when the news was brought that what he had so long waited for was attained, and that Brusa had yielded itself to his son Orchan. It was his consolation in the gloom of closing life, when old ties were broken, and his course was ending. Four months before, the father of his wife, the friend and counsellor of his own manhood, the holy Scheikh Edebali, had been buried after a life of 120 years; a month after, his daughter, the chosen wife of Othman, had been buried by his side; and Othman was now following them. In the hamlet where he lay, his chief companions, the first men who had helped him in counsel and deed, men of the sword and men of prayer, were gathered round his bed—they were six, and Orchan the seventh. He charged them to carry his bones to Brusa; he would take possession of it at least in death. There his tomb, beneath the 'silver vault' of the old Cathedral of the castle, was shown till the beginning of this century, when a fire devastated Brusa; but the resting-place of his body is also claimed by one of those humble Bithynian villages' which profess to preserve so many of the monuments of the Ottoman fathers. 'Rule mercifully and justly, and uphold the law of Islam,' were his last words to his successor Orchan. So died 'Black Osman, the Longhanded.' He had lived simply, like the early warriors of his religion. He left neither silver nor gold; a salt-cellar, a spoon, an embroidered robe, and a new turban, were all the household treasures of him, whose descendants were the most gorgeous of barbarian kings: but he left some choice steeds; and the beautiful flocks of the Sultan which still pasture in the meadows of Brusa, are of the pure breed of those of Othman. The banner by which he was invested with

<sup>1</sup> Leake, p. 15.

his first dignity, and his scymitar, with waving blade and double point, are said to be still treasured as sacred relics in the armoury at Constantinople.

Orchan was comforted, as Othman had been, for the loss of a father, by the possession of a new conquest, and the birth of an eldest son. The same system of indefatigable attacks, waged with a steady and patient purpose, against the Greeks, was carried on by him, and the companions of his father's wars. Masters of the plain between Brusa and Nicæa, they had begun to encroach on the last remaining district of Bithynia, the country which forms one bank of the Bosphorus and faces Constantinople. Walls which they could neither batter nor scale did not discourage them. They prowled about the enclosures of Semendra, till one day a gate was opened to carry forth the governor's son to burial; the Ottoman riders swooped on the funeral procession, and the mourners and their town became their prey. The ramparts of Aidos withstood the power of Konuralp and Abdurrahman; but the heart of the governor's daughter was not proof against the manly beauty of Abdurrahman, whom she had seen from the walls; wrapping a letter to him about a stone, she threw it among the beleaguering armies, and concerted a plan by which in the night they gained admittance into the town. Such are the stories told of the gradual advance of the Ottomans. They are stories, not of fiery valour, but of wily and persevering watchfulness for opportunities. The great city of Nicomedia was taken, or perhaps retaken; and a new Ottoman province, called after the white-bearded warrior who had subdued it, Kodscha-Ili, the 'Old Man's Land,' was formed out of the further peninsula of Bithynia, and added to Orchan's paternal inheritance of Sultan-Ceni.

The supineness of the Greek Emperor now became alarmed. Perhaps he had looked on the exploits of the Ottomans, as the Scottish king at Stirling or Edinburgh might look on the forays of the Moss-troopers, or on a Highland raid. He resolved, at length, to show himself in person to the troublesome and inselent freebooters. When for once they had departed from their custom of slaughtering the conquered garrisons, and offered him the governor of Aidos if he would ransom his officer, he had returned the answer worthy of bolder times, but only in place then, 'The Cæsar neither sells men, nor buys them.' He passed the Bosphorus with an army. The last and stoutest bulwark of the Empire in Asia, Nicæa, whose defence had rivalled in obstinacy the doggedness of its blockaders, now stood in pressing need of relief. The Greek imperial soldiers had beaten back the Seljouk Turks in many a field, and Orchan and his horsemen, formidable to the degenerate militia of the

Bithynian towns, were not yet prepared to encounter him. But, according to the accounts of the Greek eye-witnesses, the Emperor seems to have had no other idea, than a short and pompous military parade on the coast of the Propontis, without object or plan. When he had consumed two days in marching a few miles along the shore, while Orchan cautiously observed him from the heights, his counsellors proposed to him to offer battle, and if the Ottoman would not come down and accept it, to return as a conqueror to Constantinople. This was done next day. The confused and obviously mendacious account of Cantacuzene claims, in the first instance, a complete and sanguinary victory over a detachment of Turks, only 300, sent down to skirmish in the plain. But, after giving in full the speeches made by himself and by the Emperor, to animate the assailants, or to praise the victors, the same writer relates, that when the Greeks had victoriously driven their enemies to the hills, the Ottomans broke down upon the Greek host, 'disordered,' says Cantacuzene, 'with the excitement of a fresh attack, which the chiefs were unable to restrain;' and the result of the encounter was a hurried and disastrous retreat of the Emperor and his army. In the affray, he was himself wounded, and exposed to danger. Till the transports, which the Emperor urgently sent for, should arrive, the soldiery were dismissed, in separate detachments, to find refuge in the nearest forts. At Philocrene, while the throng of fugitives was pressing for admission, the key of the gate was mislaid, and the Ottoman horsemen were at once upon the rear of the crowd hewing down the hindmost. The next day, the fight, or the retreat, was renewed, and the great Hetæriarch, the Captain of the Greek body-guard, was slain. The Greek camp was taken, and with it the Emperor's tent and 200 of his horses with purple saddles. The imbecile vanity of the Byzantines has led them to give importance to this single and miserable attempt to arrest the Ottomans in Bithynia. But the inconsiderable numbers, given by Cantacuzene, both of the fighters and of the victims on both sides, show its real insignificance; and the Turkish historians, though it was the first encounter of their countrymen with the Greek Emperor in person, and a successful one, do not think the fight of Pelekancn worthy so much as of mention.

But it gave Nicæa into their hands. Wearied out with a long and unaided resistance, and thinned by famine and a plague, the inhabitants capitulated. They bargained for a free retreat with their property; but few of them took advantage of the condition. The majority chose rather to remain under the yoke of the unbeliever, than to cross over to Europe and

experience once more the justice and care of the Christian dynasty, which had first ruined them, and then left them a prey to the barbarians. Orchan did not molest them. He withheld his soldiers from the spoil of the city: but the widows and orphan daughters of those who had died from the sword or sickness during the siege, he distributed as wives to his followers. The Tartar blood of the whole tribe, as well as that of the chief and his companions, was early and largely mixed with that of their more highly civilized subjects.

Orchan at once turned Nicæa into a Moslem city, as his father had done with the Black Castle, on the Thymbres. In Nicæa was still seen, and still used for Christian worship, the memorable church, in which the 318 bishops had met to settle the faith of Christendom for the ages to come. The Church of the Council was turned by Orchan into a mosque; for the mosaic images on its walls was substituted the symbol of Islam; and amid the rubbish which now marks its site, Orchan's name appears sculptured over the doorway, 'like a phantom light among ruins.' Here, attached to this mosque, was the first Ottoman college founded, with its first publicly endowed teacher, the learned David of Cæsarea. 'In the place,' says Von Hammer, 'where the two bishops, Eusebius of Nicomedia and his namesake of Cæsarea, had been compelled, on pain of deposition and exile, to renounce their heresy and subscribe the Nicene formula, Christian children, destined to recruit the ranks of the Janissaries, were now forced to forswear their faith; and here did Mollah David of Cæsarea comment and split hairs on the incomprehensible subtleties of the renowned mystical work, "The Seal Ring of Philosophies." Here also Orchan established the first *Imaret*, or kitchen for the poor, a kind of foundation which became a favourite one among his successors and their servants; a devout disciple of the old Scheikh Edeballi was set over it; and here Orchan himself, with Moslem piety, served the poor in person, distributed to them their dole of pottage with his own hands, and with his own hands lit the lamps at evening.

But Nicæa retained its importance under the Ottomans only for a short time. The seat of government of the district of Kodscha-Ili was soon transferred from it to Nicomedia; and Nicomedia itself was shortly eclipsed by the fair city of Brusa, which became first the capital of a third canton, in addition to those of Sultan-Ceni and Kodscha-Ili, and then of the rapidly increasing kingdom itself. A manufacture of pottery was all that sustained the fame of Nicæa; that too has disappeared; and now Nicæa has to be sought for, within the vast circuit of its own solid and uninjured walls, which seem the enclosure of

a wild and forsaken chase, where Moslem pilgrims search for the tombs of some of the heroes of their early history, or the visitor from the West, with still greater difficulty, endeavours to trace the faint memorials, or to call up to his mind the image, of the famous Christian city.<sup>1</sup>

Orchan was now undisputed lord of Bithynia. But though his immediate neighbourhood to Constantinople made his position a troublesome one to the Greek Emperor, he was still in appearance the least considerable, and the least to be feared, of the Turkish potentates of Asia Minor. The Emirs of the coast, from the Troad to the passes of Issus, were more powerful, and, seemingly, more enterprising. Their friendship was disputed, and their hostility deprecated or used against one another, by the military traders from the rival Italian Republics, who fought for a footing on the *Ægean* coasts, as French and English fought in later days in India; but even at the end of his long reign, the Venetians had not yet learnt to know, or did not yet deign to acknowledge, the name or authority of the Turkoman chief of Brusa.<sup>2</sup> It is remarkable, that after the conquest of Nicæa and Nicomedia, and the final subjugation of Bithynia, a pause, almost uninterrupted, and apparently deliberately self-imposed, of nearly a quarter of a century, took place in the Ottoman conquests. The single interruption, (which occurred at the beginning of this period,) was the seizure by Orchan of the neighbouring Turkish principality of Karasi, the ancient Mysia. It had been a more powerful state than his own. Two rival brothers called him in, to settle their quarrels: but where the Ottomans once gained admittance, they remained; and Karasi was the first to give way before their fortune, of those nine Turkish states which, together with them, had started to independence from the ruins of the house of Seljouk, to be one by one crushed, and again re-united, under the mightier empire of the house of Othman. But after the conquest of Mysia, a deep silence reigns over the annals of Ottoman conquest for twenty years. Orchan sat still at Brusa, and scarcely appears on the scene, except as, at length, reconciled to the Greek Emperor, then, as his ally,—his son-in-law,—and his haughty and questionable protector. The Greek Empire was falling to pieces before his eyes, torn by the quarrels of kindred and rival emperors, and the ravages of the eastern and western barbarians, whom they called in to take part in their civil wars. It was wasted and ruined by Servians and Bulgarians from the Danube; by the insolent and encroaching merchants of Genoa, Pisa, and Venice; by the merciless and irresistible footmen of the Catalan Grand

<sup>1</sup> Leake, '*Asia Minor*,' pp. 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Von Hammer, i. 130. (1353.)

Company; spring after spring, its shores saw the returning Turkish galleys, and its plains the returning Turkish horsemen. But though among them, at times, went Orchan's Ottomans, they were mixed and confounded with the greater crowds from the maritime states. Orchan looked on at the scene of decay and ruin, so near him and so inviting to his ambition; he was admitted to see with his own eyes the riches and the weakness, the confusion and the cowardice, of the Byzantine Court; he beheld his restless and adventurous rivals, the Emirs of Aidin and Saroukhan eagerly pushing for the destined prey. Yet for twenty years he held his hand, and his border remained the same. No fresh cities were taken or watched over. The old generation of Ottoman heroes, the conquerors of Brusa and Nicæa, passed away, and no new names are recorded in their place. When the Ottomans from time to time passed into Europe, with their brethren from the coast, it was merely for a summer's foray. The chief who had guided their early conquests was no longer riding at their head, and even professed to be the friend, as he had married with great pomp the daughter, of the Christian emperor. Orchan seemed to have become the most peaceful, or else the most inactive, of all the Turkish Emirs; and among the various Turkish assailants of the Greek Empire, no one at the time would have singled out him and his house, as its most terrible foe, and its destined destroyer;—no one, at least, who had not observed and understood the policy of their sagacious and persevering valour. The difference between them and the other Turks, who, contemporaneously with them, and at the moment even more fiercely than they, were breaking in upon eastern Europe, was the presence in the Ottoman house of a settled purpose. All the steps they made, though not hurried, were connected; and they never made one from which they drew back. The enterprises of the other chiefs, more alarming at the moment, were but the random and isolated adventures of robbers lusting after destruction and booty; important only as they prepared the way, by weakening the Greek Empire, for the loftier plans of their brethren.

For twenty years Orchan abstained from conquest, but he was not idle. While the Christian Empire beyond the Straits was perishing, he was busy, building up a power which was to be ready to take its place, and fit to grasp its heritage. The pastoral horde was becoming a state; the leader of the vagrant camp was taking delight in adorning the temporary capital of his house with the mosques and colleges, the hospitals and caravansaries, the fountains and tombs, which the piety and magnificence of Moslem princes are wont to rear in their royal cities. Brusa was well worth his care. From the last slopes



of Olympus it looks over a green plain of woods and meadows; the famous and beautiful mountain, with its forests and its cliffs, overhangs it behind; and its abundant and ever-flowing waters,—the warm medicinal springs which well out beneath the baths of the city, and the cold sparkling sources streaming down from above, among its rocks and plane-trees,—have made Brusa famous among Eastern cities. Not less famous is it for the choice excellence of its trees and fruits, its grapes and apricots, its chestnuts, each of forty drachms weight, and its forty kinds of pears. The sheep in its pastures produced the finest wool, its mulberry-trees the finest silk; and drew to it craftsmen, who made the work of their looms, their scarfs and embroidered stuffs, their lawn and their samit, renowned almost to our own day. Before the Ottomans appeared, Christian monasteries had gleamed among the woods of Olympus, or nestled in its folds; the hermit's cell had been hung on its precipices, or perched upon its crests, or hid within its caverns. Their place was taken by the Dervishes and the Santons, on whom Orchan bestowed his largesses with liberal hand;<sup>1</sup> and Olympus became a holy mountain, sanctified by their retreats while living, and by their sepulchres in death. Among them, also, were the earlier poets and theologians of the Ottomans, who loved the stillness and the shade of the murmuring pines. There they could lie, and look down on the glittering city and sunny plain below. The city of Orchan's choice had all that could make it dear to Moslems and orientals; it was a worthy home for the last conquerors of Islam to depart from, and return to, in their wars, and to rest in, during the days of

---

<sup>1</sup> Solitaries and devotees, some of them idiots, others fierce fanatics, others mystics, others extravagant ascetics, played a considerable part in early Ottoman history and its legends. *Abd-al-Kumral* prophesied the greatness, and led the soldiers of Orchan. *Doghli-Baba*, the 'Father of pots,' who took his name from the pots in which he kept the sour milk on which he lived;—*Geikli-Baba*, the 'Father of stags,' who, at Orchan's invitation, came riding on a goat from the woods, with a scymitar of prodigious weight, to head the besiegers of Brusa, and bearing on his shoulder a sacred plane-tree, which long flourished in the sultan's palace there;—*Abd-al-Murad*, who wrought prodigies of valour with a wooden sabre of enormous length;—*Abd-al-Musa*, who took up burning coals wrapped in cotton; were among the saintly friends of Orchan, for whom he built cells on Olympus. His son Amurath built a cell for a venerated dervish, *Postinpusch*, a religious idiot, who clothed himself in skins. In equally high reverence was held the bleating dervish of Amasia, *Kojun-Baba*, the 'Father of sheep,' who never spoke, but at the five hours of prayer bleated like a sheep, and at whose tomb Bajazet II. built 'the fairest and richest convent of the Ottoman empire.' These were all *abdals*, or solitaries. The numbers and orders of *dervishes* multiplied with rapidity under the Ottoman rule, in spite of the discouragement given in the Koran to the monastic life; and at first, exercised even more influence than in later times was possessed by the great spiritual associations of the *Ulema*, the men learned in the law of the Koran.—Von Hammer, i. 111, 151, 192, 137—141. See a curious woodcut of a 'Father of Stags,' in *Nicolai's Travels*, (Antw. 1577,) p. 207.

peace. Here the first six Sultans kept their court, and here they lie buried in stately tombs, near the mosques which they founded. Round them are the sepulchres of their children and brothers; and these are encompassed on all sides by the resting-places and memorials of the great men of the rising state, its first viziers and lieutenants; and further, 'about the mausoleums of the early Sultans and Saints of the empire, are grouped some five hundred tombs of famous men,—pashas, scheikhs, professors, orators, physicians, poets, musicians.' Thus gifted and adorned by nature, and consecrated by so many recollections and such venerable monuments, Brusa rivals Adrianople in dignity, and Bagdad in holiness, and still, when the Sultan's style and title is proclaimed, it is named as the third city of his empire.<sup>1</sup>

But while the buildings of a new capital of Islam were rising under Orchan's hand, institutions were growing up, during this interval of peace, of far greater significance and importance than the domes and walls of mosques and palaces. It was during Orchan's reign that the rudiments of what was lasting and characteristic, in the internal policy and organization of the Ottomans, were laid down by men who saw far and reached high. Orchan's brother, Alaeddin, had refused at their father's death to receive from Orchan's hand the moiety of their father's flocks and herds, which was his inheritance. 'As you will not take your portion of sheep and cattle,' said Orchan, 'you shall come and help me to feed my people.' Alaeddin then became his brother's chief minister, and is called the first Vizier, *i. e.* 'Bearer of Burdens', of the Ottoman house. To him is ascribed the beginning of the first peculiar orders and regulations which were added, in the Ottoman Statute-book, to the fundamental legislation of all Mahometan states,—the Koran, the traditionary Sunna, and the decisions of the Four Imams. The three principal objects of his attention, we are told, were, the coinage,—which was now for the first time struck in the name of Orchan, instead of that of the Iconian Sultans,—the distinctive costume, especially the head-dress, of the people,—and the organization of the army. Alaeddin's purpose, in regulating the dress, was, that while the Turkoman freebooters were growing up, under the influence of successful conquest, into the feelings of a distinct and ambitious nation, their pride in the name of Osmanlis might be kept up by a visible badge, which should mark them off, in their own eyes and that of others, from the mingled races round them. In contrast to the embroidered caps of the Greeks, and the red felt skull-cap with a turban of bright colours worn by the other Turks, the Ottoman warrior was

<sup>1</sup> See the Style, in Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie*, p. 531.

commanded to wear a plain cap of white felt, of an egg-shaped form, round which only on days of ceremony a white linen cloth was folded.

But the work which has made Alaeddin's name memorable in the annals of his race, was the laying the foundations, and establishing the model, which, in expanded proportions, continued without change for three centuries, of the Ottoman army. Alaeddin and Orchan were clearsighted enough to discern that their indefatigable, but untrained horsemen, though they had overrun Bithynia, and worried its cities into surrender, were not strong enough to win and hold for good the realms of the Eastern Cæsars. Even before the degenerate guards of the Greek Emperor at Pelekanon, as long as they kept their array unbroken, Orchan's Turkomans had held back, in vigilant but cautious suspense. And there had lately been seen, on either side of the Hellespont,—specimens of those victorious Spanish battalions, who were changing the face of war in Europe,—a body of disciplined and well-appointed infantry, for whose steady and combined valour no warriors of the East, Servian or Bulgarian, Turk or Greek, had ever been found a match, and who from their stronghold at Gallipoli had imposed terms on Constantinople, and filled the countries round with the terror of their prowess and their ferocity—the Grand Company of the Catalans. No foreign enemy had vanquished these terrible Spanish footmen; it had needed their own swords, turned against one another, to tear in pieces and disperse the Grand Company. Such soldiers—bound together by a like training and devotion to one another, and to the game of war, but by a stronger obedience and more enduring enthusiasm,—the Ottoman chiefs foresaw that they would need, for the enterprise which the other Turkish emirs probably meditated in common with them, but for which they alone patiently and carefully prepared. To the bands of wild riders, who fought as the Turkoman warriors of Bochara and Orgunje fight still, in the deserts of the Oxus, or when they harry the villages of Khorassan, Alaeddin added the rudiments, small indeed, but distinctly marked, of a regular and permanent army. A thousand footmen were enrolled, and retained for continual and united service, by privileges, by discipline, by a frame-work of ranks and divisions, and by an ample pay. This nucleus of the Ottoman infantry shortly gave place, under Orchan himself, to an institution of far more remarkable character. But the organization of the cavalry, and the names of its divisions, recalled, even in the great musters of Soleiman and Selim, the primitive appointments of Alaeddin. There were the *Akindji*, the forerunners of the army, an unpaid and uncontrolled gathering of skirmishers and plunderers; all who could

procure a horse to mount and a sabre to wield, when the call came to pillage and adventure—men who fought after the old desultory fashion of the freebooters of Othman's camp; who, as the Ottoman power grew, swelled into terrible and destructive swarms, and, led by their hereditary captain, one of the descendants of Michael the Greek renegade, used to waste the borders of Hungary and Germany, and even at last dared to penetrate past Vienna, to the sources of the Danube. Then, forming the main strength of the host itself, came the horsemen, who had received grants in the conquered districts on condition of military service; the *feudatory Spahi*, among whom, as the Ottoman conquests extended, the revenues of the lands were parcelled out, in holdings of various size and dignity, from the *Sandjak Bey*, whose banner, the single horse-tail, gathered round it and led the cavalry of a province, to the tenants of the *Timars* and the *Ziamets*, the smaller and larger fiefs, who with their squadron or their handful of retainers, or perhaps their single horse and scymitar, swelled the levies of the Pacha who ruled over what, perhaps, had been once a kingdom. And, lastly, as a guard to the person and standard of the Prince, Alaeddin appointed a body of *paid* cavalry, divided, according to the favourite Turkish number, into four squadrons; a division which, with its names of the *Silihdars* and the paid *Spahis*, and the 'Foreigners' and 'Stipendiaries' of the right and left wings, remained unchanged in the regular Ottoman cavalry, whose increased pay and privileges and numbers made them, in after times, formidable yet unequal rivals, in turbulence and audacity, to the redoubtable footguards of the empire,—the Janissaries.

This great military corporation, the most remarkable that the world has ever seen grow up within the laws and policy of a state, traced its origin, according to the chief Ottoman annalists, to the counsellors of Orchan. Alaeddin's first experiment of a body of foot-soldiers, raised probably from the Turks of Bithynia and the neighbouring countries, was a failure. Pay and privileges could not reconcile them to the yoke of discipline; and the materials were not to be looked for, among these untameable freebooters, of a soldiery which should be trained to rival the steady valour of the Catalans. But the grim and patient sagacity of Ottoman enthusiasm and Ottoman policy was not long at fault. Allied by marriage to the old Scheikh Edebali, Black Halil Tchendereli had been one of the trusted seven who stood round the deathbed of Othman, and gathered up his last words; and when Alaeddin and Orchan's son Soleiman were dead, Black Halil became Orchan's Grand Vizier, and left his high dignity to his children of the third generation, for nearly a hundred years, till his great grandson was cut off in the very year in which he had

seen his master take possession of the palace and cathedral of the Cæsars. Black Halil was now 'Judge of the Host;' and he showed to Orchan and his counsellors, that though grown-up Turkomans could not be brought under discipline, children could be schooled to anything. The children of the conquered, he said, like all that belongs to them, are given to the conquerors, by the Prophet's law; and that law, besides, declares, that every child, of whomsoever born, brings with him into the world the disposition to embrace Islam. A school of Christian children, cut off from home and country, and trained with rigid discipline to the faith of the Prophet and the practice of arms, will grow up into an obedient and yet zealous and devoted soldiery. They will not much remember, in the pride of soldiership and the excitement of conquest, their old faith and friends; but their Christian and subject kinsmen will often look with wistful and envious eyes, to the honours and privileges of the children who were ravished from them. *They* will not wish to go back to Christendom and bondage; but many Christians will be tempted to come and share their religion and fortunes. Islam will be served and strengthened by the best blood of Christendom, and the numbers of its martyrs swelled by those who must have otherwise perished in their ignorance.

Other barbarous tribes, weak in numbers, but ambitious in purpose, have, before the Ottomans, recruited themselves from their subjects or their slaves.<sup>1</sup> But none ever employed this resource with such ruthless and deliberate system. The tendency to this policy, is discernible under Othman, in his foreign marriages, and in the story of the Greek renegade, Michael; but its establishment in a systematic shape was the deep and far-seeing invention of Black Halil. His counsel led to the formation of the Janissaries from Christian captive boys, and, later on,<sup>2</sup> to the establishment of a *fixed* tribute of young children, from the Christian population, to feed their schools,—a tribute which in the flourishing times of the Ottomans was continually exacted, though, probably, with Turkish irregularity and caprice, chiefly from the frontier provinces, and which lasted till the seventeenth century.<sup>3</sup> But his suggestion also expressed what has been in every age one of the chief secrets of Ottoman success. The

<sup>1</sup> Of the Lombards, a tribe not unworthy to be compared with the Ottomans, Tacitus had said, 'Langobardos paucitas nobilitat. Plurimis ac valentissimis nationibus cineti, non per obsequium, sed præliis et periclitando tuti sunt;' and Gibbon adds, that 'the smallness of their numbers was recruited by the adoption of their bravest slaves.' Chap. xlii.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently under Amurath I.

<sup>3</sup> The last levy of children from the Danube, Bosnia, Albania, and Greece, is said to have been under Amurath IV. in 1638: Von Hammer, iii. 177; Cf. Finlay, ii. 597; and a fuller and interesting account in Ranke's 'Ottoman Empire,' (translated by Kelly: London, 1843;) from Buabequius the Austrian envoy, and the Venetian *Relazioni*, from 1553—1637.

Ottomans have conquered and ruled by conduct and enterprise, by blood and sinew, which were Christian once. 'From the seminaries of the Janissaries, and the Sultan's pages,' says Von Hammer, 'issued the greatest men of the Ottoman empire. As long as the yearly levy of Christian children continued, and the expeditions of the Ottomans yielded their yearly booty of slaves, their most famous statesmen and generals were, for the most part, born Greeks, Albanians, and Bosniacs, and seldom native Turks. Thus the strength of Turkish despotism repaired itself in the heart-blood of Christendom; and by means of this cunning engine of statescraft, Greece was compelled to tear herself to pieces by the hands of her own children.'<sup>1</sup> The remark was made before him by a Venetian diplomatist at the court of Selim II.—'It is in the highest degree remarkable,' he exclaims, 'that the wealth, the administration, the force,—in short, the whole body politic of the Ottoman empire, reposes upon, and is intrusted to men, born in the Christian faith, converted into slaves, and reared up as Mahometans.'<sup>2</sup>

A long time must have elapsed before Black Halil's plan could have borne its fruit, and Christian children have been moulded into Moslem warriors. There is an interval of half a century before we hear of the Janissaries appearing in the Ottoman wars. Their first recorded field was the fight of Iconium, (1386,)—the first foes against whom their valour was pointed, were the kindred and rival Turks of Karaman. But from this time, in every great battle, and in every political crisis, their name is prominent. They were essentially and in their idea a body of picked and trained slaves—the household and family of their master; and it is in strange contrast with the fierce doings of this terrible soldiery, that in their titles of military rank, their internal subdivisions, their characteristic usages, we find only the homely names and menial associations of domestic life. They were numbered according to their *odas* or 'chambers:' in each of their ninety-'nine chambers,'<sup>3</sup> they were officered by a 'head soup-maker,' a 'head cook,' a 'head water-carrier,' and a 'manciple,' or 'caterer;' and after that Mahomet the Conqueror had incorporated with the original sixty-six 'chambers' the thirty-three companies of the servants of his kennels, (*Segbans*,) the four high officers who came next in rank to the Aga, and to his lieutenant, the Kiaia, or 'minister of the slaves,' kept their servile names, which denoted that they were respectively charged with the care of the hounds, the mastiffs, the bloodhounds, and the cranes of the Sultan's

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> Barbaro, (1573.) in Ranke, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> This is exclusive of the 100 companies of the armed pioneers and footmen, *Piade* and *Yaya*, who were originally a feudatory corps of infantry, but were afterwards incorporated with the Janissaries.—Von Hammer, i. 98, 727.



hunting establishment. Their military badge was the wooden spoon, worn in their cap, with which they ate their soup. What the Caroccio was to the militia of the Italian cities, what their eagles were to the legions of Rome and France, the great iron soup-kettle of the mess was to the Janissaries; they gathered round it for deliberation, as well as to share together the daily allowance from their master's bounty; and a vizier's head was about to fall, or even a Sultan's, and uproar and bloodshed soon to fill the streets of Constantinople and the courts of the palace, when the slaves sat in grim and gloomy silence round the hallowed symbol of their union, and refused to touch their master's meat.

But these armed slaves were also the most remarkable and most lasting of military brotherhoods. The world has seen some singular instances of men bound to one another, for the sole purposes of war, by principles or obligations deeper and stronger than those, which hold together for a time the fleeting assemblage of a common army—the soldier citizens of Sparta, the Roman legions of the Empire, the monks of the Temple and the Hospital, the troopers of Cromwell's 'new model.' But all the conditions and all the feelings which concentrated and which inspired the valour of Spartan citizens and Roman legionaries, of the brethren of the military orders, and the troopers of Naseby and Dunbar, were combined in the institute of the Janissaries. The ties of home and family which had been burst for ever when the boy began his training, were never allowed to reunite, even in a strange land and a different faith, as long as the soldier could do his work. The hunger and thirst, the watchings and the labours, which annealed to their due temper the spirit and frame of the Spartan boy, were not greater than those which exercised the young postulant of the Janissaries, when he was sent to Anatolia or the schools of the capital, to learn his new language, to imbibe his new fanaticism, and to practise the arms which he was to handle till his death. The mind of the Spartan boy, when he grew to be a man, was not more thoroughly warped from all the influences and interests of civil and social life, to think of war as the only end for which it was worthy to live, and to long for it, as his holiday and refreshment after the austerities of peace, than that of the new recruit, who entered one of those dormitories filled with the fiercest of the Moslem soldiery, all of whom had been once, like himself, baptized in infancy into the faith of Christ. Nor did the training, at once so crushing and so inflaming, so narrow and so intense, relax there. In these 'convent-like barracks' all was silence and subjection. The younger humbly served and waited on the elder. Within the walls, and among the brotherhood itself,

the word of the superior was the only law, the instinct of the inferior submissive obedience; without the walls, the lowest knew no master, except their Sultan. They were men who recognised no old kindred: they were not allowed to seek a new one in marriage.<sup>1</sup> Such is the picture which Venetian residents and Austrian nuncios have preserved of this wonderful association, in its early days.<sup>2</sup> The only comparisons by which they could convey an adequate idea of their order, their rigid discipline, their simple and sparing fare, their coarse garb, their silence, their grave self-command, the stillness which reigned in their barracks and in their immovable lines, their blind and absolute obedience, were drawn from the austerities and self-abnegation of monastic life. They were soldiers, but soldiers whose demeanour and appearance was that of monks.

Nor was the comparison far wrong. The animating principle of that fiery valour, which, in the early Ottoman wars, boasted—and enemies confirmed the boast<sup>3</sup>—that the Janissaries had never fled in battle, was a religious one. The bond of their companionship was an affiliation to a religious order. The well-known formula of the consecration of their institute, when Orchan or Amurath led the *New Soldiers* to receive their name and their benediction from the Scheikh Hadji Bektash, need not be repeated here.<sup>4</sup> The Janissaries called themselves the children and family of this great saint of Islam. They wore to the last the badge of their spiritual relationship; the strip of coarse cloth, which hung down behind from their white felt caps, represented the sleeve of the Dervish's mantle, with which he covered the head of the first Janissary when he named and blessed him. Hadji Bektash was also the founder of an order of Dervishes; and between these two families,—the brethren of prayer and the brethren of the sword—the strictest fellowship was kept up. The Janissaries were incorporated with the order of the Bektash dervishes. The Scheikh of the Bektashes was, in virtue of his religious office, the chief of the 99th *Oda* of the Janissaries: in their barracks, eight of the Bektash dervishes prayed day and night for the welfare of the realm and a blessing on the scimitars of their brothers. When those famous soldiers were destroyed, the Bektash dervishes were proscribed with them,

<sup>1</sup> Ranke, p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Ranke, pp. 7, 8.

<sup>3</sup> Ranke, p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> 'Standing in front of their ranks, he stretched the sleeve of his gown over the head of the foremost soldier, and his blessing was delivered in these words:—"Let them be called Janissaries, (*Yengi cheri*, or new soldiers;) may their countenances be ever bright! their hand victorious! their sword keen! May their spear always hang over the head of their enemies! and wheresoever they go, may they return with a *white face*.'" Gibbon, chap. lxiv; who assigns the institution and the consecration to the time of Amurath, the son of Orchan. Von Hammer, who gives it to Orchan, quotes as his authorities two of his earliest Turkish annalists, Neschri and Aali.

and shared their fate; and even now, in the extreme corners of the empire, travellers meet with a survivor of the condemned order, asking, with trembling, whether the men who slew the Janissaries, and chased away their brothers, are still in power.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the religious enthusiasm which had carried the first Arabs through their career of conquest, was revived and concentrated in these household slaves. It consecrated and gave dignity to their servitude, and raised them to be the most privileged body among their fellows. The Sultan was their comrade as well as their master, and inscribed himself by his simple name, as the first common soldier,<sup>2</sup> on their muster rolls. If the idea of a religious soldiery was suggested to the Ottomans by the knights of the Christian orders,<sup>3</sup> it found in Islam a still more congenial home. Christian Europe, which welcomed to its bosom monastic devotion, refused a lasting place in its system to a monastic soldiery. The ambition and power of the Temple, like its brilliant but troubled glory, soon passed away, struck down by the jealousy of the western kings. The Knights of S. John had a longer and nobler history. Bravely, but in vain, on the bastions of Rhodes,—bravely, and *not* in vain, on the rocks of Valetta, they stood at bay, when the armadas of the Ottomans awed the Mediterranean,—when Turkish corsairs swept the shores of Italy and Provence, and the name of Barbarossa or Draghut fluttered the cardinals within the walls of Rome. But relegated to their distant outposts,—keeping garrison in their island-strongholds, or afloat on their galleys in the eastern seas,—the knights exercised no influence on Christendom, except by the tales which came home of their heroic valour. When the Turk had ceased to menace, their work was done, and they languidly expired. But the company of the Janissaries at once made and marred the fortunes of the state within whose precincts it grew up: they were the nerve of its conquering armies, and the masters of its princes; they grew from the most exclusive of soldieries, to a great social guild,<sup>4</sup> and ramified from the barracks of the capital to the bazaars and caravanserais of the remotest towns;<sup>5</sup> and when they were

<sup>1</sup> Macintosh's 'Tour in Turkey,' ii. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Ubicini, p. 443.

<sup>3</sup> Von Hammer, i. 140.

<sup>4</sup> The steps of their decline are traced by Ranke, pp. 19, 20.—'1. Under *Soleiman I.* (1520—66), the Janissaries took themselves wives. 2. Under *Selim II.* (1566—74), they had their sons enrolled among them. 3. Under *Amurath III.* (1574—95), they were forced to admit among them native Turks, of a totally different descent, who had not undergone their training. 4. Under *Ahmed I.* (1595—1617), the privates, then stationed in the country and on the frontier, began to ply trades, to engage in commerce, and, satisfied with the advantages of the name, to think little of arms.'

<sup>5</sup> 'The prosperity and trade of Trebizond are perpetually disturbed by the

rooted up to save the state, it is doubtful whether the core and life of the state were not rooted up with them.

Orchan could well afford to stay his hand from conquest for twenty years, when those years were the first years of growth to the company of the Janissaries,—the years in which its strange and formidable character was clearly determined and strongly impressed on it, and the spirit breathed into its silently forming elements, which was to be the gage of continual victory and wide dominion, and which centuries were not to extinguish. But though the Ottoman frontier was not advanced, Orchan was by no means an unconcerned spectator of the scene of ruin and dissolution which the Greek empire beyond the Straits presented. Since the Ottomans had defeated the Byzantine emperor at Pelekanon, the pedant courtier, his master's trusted favourite, who lost, and who has left us the story of that disgraceful day, had become by his intrigues the usurping partner, and then the open rival, of his master's infant son. Cantacuzene warred with a Palæologus for the Empire, as the Palæologi had been in the habit of fighting for it among themselves. They were not content to burn and destroy, by the hands of their own soldiers, what was left to the Empire of its towns and cultivated districts; they invited to their aid the Turkish hordes from Bithynia, the Turkish pirates from Smyrna and the coasts of Caria and the Troad; and in return for such uncertain and precarious assistance as they were willing to render, the competing Christian emperors gave them free licence to pillage and enslave throughout their provinces, and formally consented to the demand, that the robbers should have a market for their Christian slaves in the capital of eastern Christendom.<sup>1</sup> Cantacuzene is not ashamed to dwell with self-complacent conceit—for in such a man it can hardly be called pride—on the close intimacy which continued till death between himself and a Turkish chief of freebooters; and celebrates what he calls the good faith and constant honour of his Mahometan friend, who was a useful counterpoise to Cantacuzene's enemies, but whose barbarian swarms wasted Cantacuzene's land, and swept off his subjects as ruthlessly as other Turks. Cantacuzene found a romantic friend in the Emir of Smyrna;<sup>2</sup> but in the Emir of Brusa,

factions quarrels of two *odas* of Janissaries, in one of which 30,000 *Lazi* are commonly enrolled.' Gibbon, (from De Tott, [1784.] iii. 261.) chap. lxxviii. 'The Turks of Macedonia who bear arms are Spahis, Yuruks, and Janissaries. The Spahis are the cavalry formed by the holders of the ziamets and timars, when called on by the government. The Yuruks cultivate their own lands, chiefly in the mountainous districts. The Janissaries are the garrisons of the fortified places, among whom are generally enrolled the greater part of the heads of families engaged in trade or manufactures, or who have landed property in the neighbouring plains.'—Leake, (in 1806.) Northern Greece, iii. 249.

<sup>1</sup> Finlay, 552, 553. 572; Gibbon, viii. p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 60.

as we learn from his own unblushing narrative, the heir of Augustus and Constantine was glad to find a son-in-law. Orchan demanded, as the price of allowing his horsemen to ride and ravage in the name of Cantacuzene, rather than of Paleologus, that Cantacuzene should give him his daughter Theodora.<sup>1</sup> Cantacuzene took counsel with his friend, the Emir of Smyrna, and followed his urgent advice to enlist, by any means, so important an auxiliary on his side. When in after years, a deposed emperor, and a monk in one of the convents of Athos, he looked back on his schemes and deeds of ambition, and wrote their story, he had the heart to perpetuate the minute and pompous ceremonial with which his royal daughter, the daughter of the Emperor of the East, was delivered over to her Turkoman and infidel husband. Pompous and minute as the ceremonial was, one thing was left out—there was wanting even the form of Christian marriage.<sup>2</sup> So low had the purple of the Cæsars fallen; so rapidly had the fortunes mounted, of the son of the shepherd 'freebooter of the Bithynian hills.' The bride of Orchan's youth was the Greek chief's wife, whom his father's riders had carried off in a border fray. Fifty years had passed; and now the bride of his old age was another Christian damsel, the noblest of her country, given to him publicly in the face of the imperial city, with all the magnificence and formality of the most ceremonious court in Christendom.<sup>3</sup> And yet this loathsome and infamous sacrifice was not enough to purchase even a respite. Two years after his marriage, Orchan paid a solemn visit to the Byzantine court, and nothing was spared to do him honour. But the visit was scarcely over, when picked bands of Ottomans were across the Hellespont, wasting the Thracian cities, sweeping off booty and slaves from the very gates of Constantinople, and encountering in battle the Emperor Cantacuzene himself. When the traders of Genoa, from their fortified factory of Galata, bearded and assailed the emperor in his own harbour and palace, Orchan without scruple listened to their request for assistance, and, though in a state of profound peace with Cantacuzene, lent his Ottomans, to help them to insult his ally and his kinsman. At last the hollow friendship, which was Cantacuzene's main support on the throne, ceased even to be professed;

<sup>1</sup> Finlay, 572. 'His throne was only supported by his close alliance with his son-in-law, Orkhan, whose troops were allowed to use the Greek territories as a hunting-ground, to supply their slave-markets.'

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon, viii. p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Von Hammer, i. 128. 'Between his first and his last marriage a half century had passed of conquest; and in the interval, the Grecian wife was changed from the ravished Castellan's bride into the emperor's daughter, freely bestowed, and delivered to him with the pomp of a state ceremonial.'

Orchan negotiated alike with both the rival emperors, and seeing his own interest in keeping alive their quarrel, favoured each by turns, to weaken and destroy the other's power.

At length, at the very close of Orchan's life, the march of Ottoman conquest, which had been suspended for the work of consolidation, took up what had been left off at the fall of Nicomedia and the annexation of Mysia, and resumed its course. The Ottomans, like the other Turks, had long been too well known on European ground; but with the sea between them and their homes in Asia, they had not yet dared to settle there. At last they made the stride which separates ravage from conquest. Othman lived to see Brusa; Orchan, the conqueror of Brusa for his dying father, reigned till the Hellespont was crossed and Gallipoli occupied by his son Soleiman. Each saw the first step made in the enterprise which filled the thoughts of his life; but the conquest of a province, which had been the ambition of the father, had swelled into that of an empire, in the plans and meditations of the son.

This great and decisive step, which, to the Greeks of the time, seemed but an ordinary incident in the harassing and insulting warfare to which they had become familiarized and resigned, is felt in its full importance by the Turkish historians; and if the details of their narrative are doubtful and untrustworthy, the Ottomans showed their sense of the event itself, by the legendary, if not fabulous, halo with which they invest it. It is the first occasion on which they think it worth while to record the passage of their countrymen into Europe. Soleiman, the son of Orchan, say the Turkish chroniclers, was spending the night—a fine moonlight night—among the ruins of what had been Cyzicus. His fancy was moved and his spirit awed by the sight of abandoned grandeur, of which the history was unknown to him: as he gazed on broken columns, and marble pavements over which the waves rippled, and triumphal arches reflected on the waters, he thought he saw one of the ancient cities which the genii had built for Solomon, with Persepolis and Tadmor; he believed himself among the palaces of Balkis, the Queen of the South, and the wonderful magnificence of the days of old, when the true believers were helped by the hand of Heaven. Again he looked, and the radiance of the moon upon the sea seemed to stretch away to the Thracian hills, and to be like a silver band joining his lands to the lands of the infidel—Asia to Europe. He remembered the dream of Othman, and how there the full moon was the presage and opening of his ancestor's vision of empire. Again the moon



was shining; and he seemed to hear in the murmur of the waves a call to follow where the radiant path across the waters pointed. Then, says the legend, his resolution was taken to bind the two continents together by the might of the Ottomans; and it was confirmed by the old warriors, whom his father had given him as counsellors in the government of his province. That same night two of them—Adsché-beg and Ghazi Fazil—rowed across the strait in a shallop, and brought back with them a Greek prisoner, who told them that the fort of Tzympe, a short distance from Gallipoli, was left without a garrison. Soleiman cut ox-hides into strips, and with them bound together trunks of trees into two rafts; thirty-nine of his bravest companions, and himself the fortieth—the legend keeps the favourite number, like the forty companions of Othman, and the forty robbers of the Arabian tale—trusted themselves on the rafts, and on the following night were ferried across the Hellespont. Among them were the great Ottoman heroes of the time, with the renegade Greek chief of Brusa, Evrenos, the future conqueror of Greece and Macedonia, who was to grow grey as the most renowned among the captains of Amurath and Bajazet. The defenders of Tzympe were abroad in the fields, gathering in their harvest beneath the moonlight: a dung heap had been left, raised against the rampart, and over it the Ottomans mounted. They were followed next day by a large body in barks, and before three days were over 3,000 Turks had crossed to Tzympe, and held it fast. This crossing of the Hellespont is fixed by the Ottoman historians in the year 1356.

Cantacuzene was at the very moment asking the help of Orchan against the rival Greek Emperor. Orchan sent Soleiman himself; he beat back the Servian and Bulgarian allies of Palæologus, and then swept the valley of the Hebrus on his own account. But within a few months, a fearful catastrophe of nature threw open still wider to the Ottomans the gates of the Greek empire. While Cantacuzene and Orchan were negotiating about the restitution of Tzympe, an earthquake laid in ruins the cities of the Chersonese, and shattered their ramparts. It was winter; torrents of rain were followed by snow and piercing frosts; and in the midst of desolation and death from the fury and bitterness of the elements, the Ottoman robbers, 'like evening wolves,' came rushing in through the riven walls, to plunder, and now to occupy, the ruined cities. In this way they seized Gallipoli, while their chiefs were treating about the ransom of Tzympe.

It would have been surprising, if anything but force could have wrung back from the wily Ottoman a prize of which he knew so well the value. But his answer to the remonstrances

of his father-in-law and ally Cantacuzene, is characteristic of the grave and ironical perfidy, which soon became one of the distinguishing marks of his family and race. Cantacuzene, he said, had no right to demand back Gallipoli, and the neighbouring towns of the Chersonese, 'for it was not the force of arms which had given them to the Ottomans, but the earth-quake.' Cantacuzene, according to some historians, was unable to pay the ransom which the Turk demanded. But it is plain that no ransom would have paid the price of that secure lodgement in Europe, which the opportunity of the moment had given him, and which was obviously the next step, whenever it could be taken, in the manifest policy of Orchan's house.

The operations of modern war have but lately reminded us of the importance of Gallipoli as a military position, where the safety of Constantinople is at stake. Its importance in the times of Orchan might have been less, if the maritime superiority of the Greeks, which at this period seems clear over the light Turkish barks, had been turned to account by resolute and able leaders. But in the hands that ruled Byzantium, it was useless. Fifty years before, the Catalan Grand Company had seized on Gallipoli, and from this commanding stronghold, joined to the land only by a narrow isthmus, and open to the sea, had sallied forth at will, to ravage the Greek provinces, to help or to overthrow an Emperor, and to insult the Imperial City at its gates. The system and the success of the Catalans, in this as in other instances, were obviously not lost on the Ottomans, who possessed their valour and their internal discipline, with far more of settled and formidable purpose. At Gallipoli, they held a post impregnable to the Greeks, which at once secured the ferry between Europe and Asia, and gave them the mastery of the approaches to the harbour of Constantinople. The same system of waiting and watching at the gates, which had given Brusa, Nicæa, and Nicomedia into their hands, was now applied on a larger scale to the reduction of the capital of the Empire.

In Gallipoli, Soleiman settled a colony of Asiatics,—Turks and Arabs,—and divided the lands of the Chersonese among the warriors who had been, according to the Turkish legend, the companions of his nocturnal voyage across the Hellespont. Many of them left their names to the places where they resided, and the tombs of some of these heroes of Islam make Gallipoli a venerable spot. But it is still more sacred in the eyes of Ottomans, as possessing the tomb of Soleiman himself. He died, shortly after leading his people into Europe, not in the battle-field, nor from disease, but because his horse stumbled, while he was flying his hawks in a field near Bulair. He was buried where he fell, by a mosque which he had

built, within view of the sea. His grave marks the northern entrance of the Hellespont, as that of Protesilaus does the southern. 'For a hundred years,' says Von Hammer, 'he was the only Ottoman prince who lay buried in European earth; and his tomb continually invited the races of Asia to perform their pilgrimage to it with the sword of conquest. Of all the hero-tombs which have been hitherto mentioned in connexion with Ottoman history, there is none more renowned, or more visited, than that of the second Vizier of the empire, the fortunate Crosser of the Hellespont, who laid the foundation of the Ottoman power in Europe.' The atmosphere of legend still environed his memory in death. Ottoman story-tellers related to enthusiastic hearers, and Ottoman historians gravely repeat the tale, how when a mighty Christian armament landed near the holy tomb at Bulair, the hero Soleiman reappeared, leading a host of heavenly warriors, radiant with light and mounted on white horses, to the aid of his hard-pressed countrymen, and utterly destroyed the invaders. But the learned and impartial German, who has collected the Ottoman records, is at the pains to inform us, that the armament, the battle, and the victory, are irreconcilable with the more authentic facts of history.

Orchan survived his son Soleiman scarcely a year: he died in the year 1359. With Orchan and Soleiman, the lawgiver and the champion, seems to end the age of the heroes in the Ottoman annals: with the conquests of Amurath, these annals enter into the domain of European history.

Then it was known why Orchan had held back so long. When his son Amurath took up his father's work, it was seen at once, in terrible clearness, what a change had come over the Ottoman invaders. In that significant and eventful pause in their advance, the rude freebooters, who prowled in conscious and patient helplessness round the impregnable ramparts of Nice and Brusa, content if, after ten years of untired watching at their gates, they might surprise or weary out their prey, had become transformed into self-reliant and ready soldiers, able for all the works of victorious warfare, for swift, and continued, and enduring conquest. With Amurath begins, rapid and sudden, the irresistible outburst of Turkish power. Their roving bands, indeed, had long known well the routes in neighbouring Europe; they were familiar with the towns and cities of Thrace and Macedonia, under whose walls they had often swept in insulting security. They had watered their horses in the Strymon and the Axios, in the Morava and the Danube; but they had come and gone. But when, in the first year of Amurath, their squadrons issued from the fastness of the Chersonese, along the

narrow isthmus of Bulair, and through the towns which Soleiman had already occupied at its outlets and approaches, they entered to remain; they were come this time to divide and take possession. All the harassing forays of their predecessors are forgotten, compared with this great and determined advance, which in less than thirty years, for the second time in history, established an Asiatic power in Europe; and which made the Greek emperor a vassal to a Mahometan chieftain, for all that was left to him of his renowned empire,—the city and outskirts of Constantinople.

The intrigues of the rival Turks of Karaman detained Amurath for a moment in Asia; but the rebels of Galatia were soon put down, and the important castle and city of Angora, reputed by Ottoman writers one of the strongest in the line of Turkish fortresses from Buda to Van, was secured, to guard the eastern limits of the Ottomans. Then he at once crossed into Thrace, where his brother's grave seemed the call to conquest and its pledge. There was no delay in seizing the towns that remained untaken, in the vicinity and on the approaches of the Chersonese. From them he marched boldly into the heart of what had been the Greek empire. Amurath threw himself on the great military road which joins Constantinople to the Upper Danube, and so to the countries of the west: the towns upon its line were successively and swiftly occupied; while another body, under the veteran renegade Evrenos, and another of Orchan's old captains, pushed up the valley of the Hebrus. Didymotichon, the modern Demotica, the future prison of Charles XII., was taken; and Amurath, pleased with its position, and with the capture of a favourite residence of some of the Byzantine emperors, thought it worthy of being selected for the site of his first European palace. But a grander capital than Demotica was within his grasp. The Ottoman powers by the Hebrus, and the great north road, were converging on Adrianople. Hadji Ilbeki, the conqueror of Demotica, had ridden that year up to the walls of that great city, and boldly maintained the possibility of its capture. The thought of the greatness of the prize seems to have made even Amurath hesitate; but the council of war was held, and it was resolved to venture. The Greek governor of Adrianople risked and lost a battle outside the gates of the city, the first and last which the Greeks dared with Amurath. The Greeks fled, and Adrianople surrendered. In Amurath's first campaign in Europe, before he had been two years on the throne, the rival capital to Constantinople, lying opposite its very gates, and barring the approaches from western Christendom, came without resistance into his hands.

From this time, till Amurath's last field, no check stopped him in his steady progress. Along the great north-western road, the flame leapt from point to point, along its stations and towns, from Adrianople to Philippopolis, from Philippopolis over the passes of Hæmus to Sofia, from Sofia to Naissus, on the edge of the Servian kingdom, and within a few marches of Belgrade. Westward, along the old Egnatian way, Evrenos pushed onwards, and prepared the way to Greece: he halted only after he had crossed the Axios, at the Macedonian town of Vardar;<sup>1</sup> the castles and strongholds, which had not yielded to him on his first passage, were one by one mastered afterwards, and a line of posts in the mountain passes and on the coast secured; Serres, and the fruitful valley of the Upper Strymon, on one side, and the great city of Thessalonica on the other, at last, after several years, completed the Turkish conquests over the southern shore of Thrace. Nor were the Turkish invaders come this time merely to conquer. At the furthest points of their progress, they at once began to build and to endow, as the permanent occupants of the soil, not only for themselves, but for their posterity. At Vardar, Evrenos was the founder of richly endowed caravanserais and public kitchens for the poor; at Philippopolis, Lalashahin left his memorial, in a noble bridge of stone two bow-shots in length, and wide enough for the passage of two carriages abreast; and gave a large number of slaves, for whose sustenance he provided, to keep it in repair. The towns on each side of the great Adrianople road were captured; and thus the circle of Turkish occupation round Constantinople was completed and drawn closer, and the Emperors were isolated, at least by land, from their ancient realm. In due time, Hadji Ilbeki pushed up the valley of the Tundscha, which comes down from the Balkan to join the Hebrus at Adrianople. The towns on the pleasant southern slopes of the mountains, Iamboli and Aidos, and Sizeboli on the sea, were taken. Then the great dividing range was crossed. The Ottomans threaded from the south the defiles, which led to the plains of Bulgaria and the banks of the Danube. Then first, names are heard of, which have been heard so often, and with so much interest, since; then first we hear of the mountain-nest of Schumla, which has so often sheltered the Ottoman armies; and at the end of Amurath's reign, we hear of the Ottomans round the towns of the Lower Danube, from Nicopolis and Rustschuk to Hirsova, and of the first siege, recorded by history, of Silistria.

It was not with Greeks that the Ottomans disputed for the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Yenidje Vardar*, near the old Pella. See a sketch of it, in Lear's '*Albania*', p. 30.

Greek empire. *They* struck no blow—princes or people—for their land and homes: the invasion roused indignation and resistance, but not in them. Amurath found antagonists; but they were competitors for the inheritance of the empire and the prize of Eastern Europe, jealous that he should forestal them. His battles on Greek soil were fought with other foreigners, who wrangled with him for the helpless carcase of the Byzantine dominions. It was the Slavonic nations from the Danube and the Drave, Servians, Wallachians, and Bulgarians, who met him in his first field, and his last, and who struggled for supremacy in the plains of Thrace, with the Turkomans from the Oxus and the Caspian.

In the weakness of the Greek empire, a rival Christian state had insensibly risen on its western border, as the Ottomans had grown up on the east. Stephen Dushan, a politician, a legislator, and a warrior, had laid the foundation of a powerful kingdom amid the wooded mountains of Servia: he had established his authority and his influence over the multitude of local hereditary nobles, by whom his race, like the rest of the Slavonians, were ruled; he was received as a deliverer by the Bosnian chiefs, as a protector by the republic of Ragusa; his standard was followed by the warlike tribes from Albania; he was obeyed in Arta and Belgrade, in Macedonia and Bulgaria; and he assumed the name and the ensigns of a Roman Cæsar, the tiara, and the globe and cross. Stephen Dushan left behind him a great national name; but an unfinished work. He lighted up a high ambition in the aspiring race whom he had ruled; but he died too soon, and the nation itself was too immature, for the consolidation of the loose and refractory elements of Servian power. Servia had led the Slavonians in challenging the advance of the Ottomans, but with no fortunate issue. From the first, the superiority of the Ottomans declared itself; and the votive Styrian chapel of Mariazell, the most sacred place of pilgrimage in Austria, preserved the memory of the escape of Louis of Hungary, when he fled on the banks of the Hebrus from the Turkish scymitar, in the first encounter of the confederate Slavonians with the lieutenants of Amurath, though the Styrian legends of the sanctuary itself have changed the defeat into a victory. Thus early, though unsuccessfully, began the fierce, long struggle, between the Ottomans and the nations which found their rallying point in the house of Austria. But the part and position of the Greek emperor was a very different one. John Palæologus, after the first burst of Turkish conquest, begged for and obtained peace at Constantinople, while Amurath overran the rest of his dominions;—a peace which the Greek only on one occasion attempted to interrupt, when he went to Italy to offer the submission of the Eastern



Church as the price of a new crusade. In this he failed; an ignominious arrest at Venice for debt, which was paid by the sale or pawn of the church plate at Constantinople, detained him a while; and then he returned, to offer his services against the enemies of the Ottomans, and to spend the remainder of his reign as the humble and resigned dependent on the good pleasure of Amurath. His degraded and pitiable vassalage, as well as a terrible earnest of that merciless cruelty which ran in the blood of the Ottoman house, are shown in the story of the conspiracy against their fathers, of his son Andronicus with Saudschi, the eldest son of Amurath. Amurath, when he heard of it, summoned the Emperor to prove his own innocence at the Emir's court; and when John had, without difficulty, convinced his master that he could not have been a party to such perilous designs, Amurath called on him to join him in arms against their insurgent sons, and in a compact to blind them if they were captured. The rebels were overthrown; Amurath, say the chroniclers, approached their camp at night, and called aloud to their Ottoman soldiers to leave them. The soldiers heard once more the voice which had been wont to lead them in battle, and could not resist its fascination. The rebellious sons were taken. Amurath redeemed his pledge in full measure; he first put out his son's eyes—then, when he had discharged his promise, he slew him. Andronicus was also blinded; but it was done imperfectly, and Amurath reproached his dependent for his weak compassion for his son. He himself was guilty of no such mercy for the Greek associates of Andronicus. From the banks of the Hebrus, he looked on calmly and unmoved, while the captive nobles were thrown, tied in pairs, into the river, from the battlements of Demotica. His composure was only disturbed by a laugh of scorn, when a hare, the emblem to the Ottomans of the Greek race, crossed his view, pursued by dogs, and he saw in the circumstance a coincidence, which moved his mirth, with the bloody scene which his war hounds were enacting before him. Yet Amurath was proud enough to be magnanimous. Manuel, the emperor's second son, who had tried to raise the standard of resistance to the Turks in Macedonia, when he found every place of refuge, even his father's palace, closed against him by the terror of Amurath's name, boldly threw himself on the chance of his mercy, and appeared before him at Brusa. Amurath spared him. He pardoned his past misconduct—thus is their interview described—and warned him, that on his mended behaviour would depend the mending of his fortunes in Europe; and then he sent him to his father, and gave the Emperor leave to open the gates of his capital to his own son, on condition that he would guard him carefully. It

is the historians of the Greek empire who are our authority for these features of its decline.

Amurath inherited the organizing spirit of his father Orchan. The countries he occupied were carved out into military tenures, the smaller *Timars*, and the larger *Siamets*, for the horsemen who had come across with him from Asia, and the bases laid of that great feudal system, which so long and so inexhaustibly fed the Ottoman armies, and riveted their power over the subject races, while it prevented the conquerors from identifying themselves with the soil, or feeling themselves more than, as it were, its lessees and tenants. The privileges and the service of this feudal militia, were defined and regulated; and in the place of the old Moslem colours under which the warriors of Islam had been wont to fight—the yellow of the Prophet himself, the green of the Fatimites, the white of the Omniades, the black of the Abbassides,—the *Spahis* of the house of Othman reared that blood-red banner, so well known and so long feared in Christendom. For the service of the camp, a carriage train was organized of Christian followers, who, in consideration of the menial and burdensome duties to which they were bound, were exempt from tribute. The old law of the Koran was remembered and revived, which exacted a fifth of all the spoil, and a fifth of the price of every slave, for the use of the prince. A peace of six years was interposed in Amurath's conquests, and gave leisure, not only for the erection of mosques and palaces and baths in Adrianople, his new European capital, but for perfecting the military system, to which everything else was subordinate. The wily old man, Black Halil, who had suggested to Orchan the institution of the Janissaries, was in high power and confidence for twenty-seven of the thirty years of Amurath's reign; and the office of grand-vizier, which he bore for eighteen years, under the title of Haireddin Pasha, never went out of his family till after the fall of Constantinople. Even the Greek historians were impressed with his keen and far-sighted character, and record how carefully he was wont to impress upon Amurath, the necessity of preparing and proportioning his means and instruments for the high aim which he had before him. With such a counsellor, Amurath developed and matured the outlines of policy which Orchan had left him; and the men whose names are chiefly associated with his conquests, were mostly aged warriors, but energetic and able in their old age, who had passed their manhood as the servants of Orchan.

But it was not in Europe only that the Ottoman power was advancing with such vast strides. In Asia Minor, it rapidly absorbed two more of the smaller states, which had risen from the ruins of the Seljouks. The Emir of Kermian, the ancient

Phrygia, had to surrender his province as a marriage gift with his daughter to Amurath's son Bajazet; the Emir of Hamid, the old Pisidia, had to part with his by a forced sale. There was only one among these principalities which could pretend to measure itself with the Ottomans. The princes of Karaman occupied the plains of Iconium, the rugged masses of Taurus, and the shores of the Cilician sea. They had before shown jealousy of their rivals of the north-west. Amurath was provoked by their intrigues; and their submission was not timely enough to stop the march of an army, which he had collected for their chastisement, from his European dominions and allies, as well as from Asia. In 1386, on the field of Iconium, the Ottomans first tried their arms in a pitched battle against their Turkish brethren. The array of the Ottoman host on that decisive day is recorded, as the precedent which was ever after followed, in their many future battles. The feudal cavalry from Asia, as the fight was on their own ground, occupied the post of honour, the right wing—the troops from Europe the left—an order which was reversed, when European ground was the scene of battle. In the first line of the centre,—covered by a cloud of irregular skirmishers on foot, the *Azabs*,—stood, for the first time that history records, the 'new soldiers' raised from the Christian children in Black Halil's schools, the trained infantry of the Janissaries. Behind them was the post of the Sultan and Grand Vizier, surrounded by the squadrons of the regular cavalry of the guard, the paid *Spahis* and *Silikhars*. The Beglerbegs of Roumelia and Anatolia, the supreme military chiefs of the forces of Europe and Asia, commanded each on his own wing; but on this occasion, Amurath's two sons, Bajazet and Yacoub, were joined with them in command. The Karamanians were utterly routed; and on the field, the title of Vizier, and the distinguishing banner of the three horse-tails, were first conferred as a dignity of military honour, on Timurtash, the Beglerbeg of Roumelia, and the hero of the fight of Iconium. Amurath humbled, but was prevailed on to spare, the Emir and the state of Karaman; a storm was gathering behind him; and he had again to summon all his powers, both in Europe and Asia, to meet the danger, which was once more threatening from the banks of the Danube.

The Servians and their allies had been subdued, and Amurath had compelled Servian auxiliaries to help him against the Turks of Karaman; but the decisive trial of strength had not yet come, and the absence and occupation of Amurath in Asia, and perhaps the smart of Ottoman superiority, tempted them to enter the lists again, and for the last time, against their victorious competitor. Lazar, King of Servia,

the son of Stephen, gathered together the armies of the confederate Slavonians from the gulf of Arta and the Croatian highlands, to the plains of the Theyss, and the mouths of the Danube. Seven tongues were spoken in his camp. There were Wallachians from beyond the Danube—Poles and Hungarians from beyond the Carpathians. The Tartars of the Dobruscha had been induced to revolt from the Ottomans; and the tribes which now furnish the fiercest soldiers, wherever the Turkish power requires the most daring and unscrupulous ferocity, the Albanian and Bosnian mountaineers, were then banded together with the kindred nations of Bulgaria and Servia, which have not, like them, accepted the faith with the yoke of their conquerors. The confederates hung on the edges of the Ottoman conquests, and defeated Ottoman armies; yet Amurath seemed hardly to heed them. He was busy with the affairs of his newly-acquired Asiatic provinces;—there he was occupied in celebrating at Brusa, with pompous ceremony, the circumcision of three of his grandchildren, and his own marriage, and that of his two sons, with Byzantine princesses. At last he moved. The forces of Asia Minor were once more poured across the Hellespont. With one wing of the army, his Grand Vizier, the son of Black Halil, crossed the Balkan, smote Bulgaria, and made it from that day a Turkish province. Then, through the rugged water-courses and intricate passes, in the heart and centre of the Slavonic peninsula, where the mountain chains of Thrace and Macedonia are knotted together with the prolongations of the Dacian and Illyrian hills, Amurath pushed forward to seek the Servians. Old Evrenos, the apostate chief of Brusa, came back from a pilgrimage to Mecca, which he had just performed at the close of life, in testimony of his zeal for his second faith, to lend the Ottomans once more the renown of his formidable name, and to lead their vanguard. At Kossova, the '*Ousel's Field*,<sup>1</sup>' a pleasant plain in an amphitheatre of hills, where the borders of all the great Slavonic provinces meet, the armies engaged. Of that stoutly contested battle, the issue was not doubtful, though a great price was paid for it by the conqueror. The life of the first invader of Europe was exacted, as the sacrifice due from the Ottomans for their first great European victory—but in that victory, the liberty of the Slavonic tribes was struck down for centuries, and an omen given, of but too faithful presage, of the way in which Christian and Moslem were to meet—afterwards in many a bloody field.

The histories and legends of both nations dwell upon, and perhaps exaggerate or overcolour the remembrances of this

<sup>1</sup> "*Amselfeld*."—Von Hammer, ii. 174, 6.

eventful fight. On the eve of the battle, say the Turkish chroniclers, the mind of the stout-hearted Amurath for awhile misgave him. The banded Christian host, now that he had found it, barred his way with numbers greatly superior to his own. His army had marched far, and through rough and difficult ways; and now that the die was to be cast, the only chance left him was victory; for behind him, were the defiles of Rhodope and Hæmus, and all around, an unfriendly country. The Ottoman chiefs were divided in their counsels as to the method of attack, and night found them still disagreed. With the night came a violent wind, which drove the dust across the plain in stifling clouds into the faces of the Ottomans. Meanwhile, in the Christian camp, the proposal to take their enemies at disadvantage during the night, was rejected, for fear, it was urged, lest under the cover of darkness any of them should escape. The whole of the night Amurath spent in prayer, that if he might not conquer, he might at least have the privilege of dying a martyr for Islam. With the morning came a change: the clouds of dust which had swept over the field gave place to a soft rain; the view was cleared, and the Ottomans could see their opponents. Drawn up in the same order as at Iconium, they closed on the Christian army. The fight was obstinate and bloody: the iron mace of Prince Bajazet smote fierce and fast, and where he led, the yielding Ottomans rallied, and the Christians were scattered before the tempest of his attack; but the fortune of the day was long doubtful and threatening to Amurath, before their overthrow was completed and irretrievable. It had been almost accomplished, when, from the heaps of the slain, a Servian soldier started forth, and crying out that he had a secret message for Amurath, burst through the guards and orderlies to his person. Amurath suffered him to approach; the Servian bowed to kiss his foot, and as he raised himself, stabbed Amurath mortally. A man of prodigious strength and speed, the murderer sprang forth again through the circle of guards; three times his pursuers came up with him, and three times he shook them off; the fourth time, faint with his wounds, he was overpowered, and died under their swords. But Amurath had still strength to direct what remained to be accomplished of his victory. It was achieved while he yet lived. Lazar, the Servian king, was brought in prisoner to his tent: and while he was dying himself, Amurath ordered him to be slain, and looked on while he was put to death. Conqueror and conquered, each gazed with fierce triumph on the last moments of the other, and carried with them the certainty of his rival's fate.

Such are the Ottoman accounts of the fight of Kossova and the death of Amurath. The Servian legends and Greek historians, give a different version of the deed of Milosch Kobilovitch, the

soldier who avenged his nation's liberty on the conqueror who had struck it down. Milosch and Wuk Brancowich, say the Servian legends, had married the two daughters of King Lazar, and the sisters had quarrelled about the merit of their respective husbands. Brancowich, provoked by his own jealousy and the complaints of his wife, accused Milosch of treasonable correspondence with the Turks. On the eve of the battle, King Lazar was pledging his nobles to the morrow's good fortune, in the *Stravitza*, the silver goblet which he used; when he came to Milosch, he passed him the goblet, but reminded him that his good name was not untainted by suspicion. 'Thanks, O King, for the *Stravitza*,' said Milosch, 'to-morrow shall prove my truth.' In the morning, before the battle began, Milosch rode into the camp of the Ottomans as a deserter; and when he was brought into Amurath's tent, to kiss his foot, Milosch overturned his seat, and dealt him his death-wound. He rushed forth and reached the swift horse, which was waiting to carry him back to the Christian camp; but he had not time to mount before the sabres of the Janissaries hewed him down. The Turks then began the attack. But it was not till the evening, when King Lazar was brought in to die in the tent of his expiring enemy, that he learnt how Milosch Kobilovitsch had redeemed his pledge. With the Servians he is a patriot and an avenging hero; with the Ottomans, an assassin, whose crime was afterwards made the pretext of the insulting ceremonial, which obliged the ambassadors of Christian powers, to approach the Sultan with their arms held by attendant chamberlains. Yet even the Turks seem to have felt a kind of involuntary and admiring interest in the daring and strength which was so fatal to their great leader.<sup>1</sup> On the plain of Kossova, where a chapel marks the place where Amurath died, the Turks have set up three great stones, at intervals of fifty ells, to point out the spots where Milosch thrice sprang through the crowds of his pursuers; and in the old armoury at Constantinople, are still shown the arms and the trappings of the Servian champion and his war-horse.

Such was the first stage of that military empire which Orchan had planned for his house and race, and for which he had so patiently prepared. From the time when Amurath 'the Victorious' burst upon the Byzantine realm, it was clear that no power in the east of Europe was a match in battle for the combination of fierceness and discipline which was found alone among the Ottomans; as there was no dynasty or state which

<sup>1</sup> They are said to have shown the same feeling towards the remains and the name of their most successful opponent, Scanderbeg. When they took Alessio, they crowded round his tomb, to look on his corpse; and fragments of his bones, set in gold or silver, were worn by the Janissaries as relics or amulets.—Von Hammer, i. 545; Gibbon, c. 67.



aimed so high in its policy, and was filled with such confident and resolute enthusiasm of conquest. But the mounting fortunes and the strength of the new state were disclosed with more formidable certainty, amid the splendours, and still more, amid the vicissitudes of the reign of his successor Bajazet. Bajazet met at Nicopolis, not Asiatics, or Greeks, or Slavonians, but the choicest and proudest chivalry of the West; and he trampled them down with an overthrow more humiliating and more cruel than that of Kossova. Till his last fatal field, no check suspended the proud and prosperous sweep of his victorious armies, from Widdin to the Morea, from Smyrna and Sinope to the Euphrates. Yet the victory of Nicopolis, and the ancient empire of the east in Europe and Asia once again united beneath his feet, are less striking proofs of the vigour of the Ottoman state, than the disasters of Angora. Few eastern dynasties, few nations anywhere, in the outset of their career, could have so endured the shock and strain of that memorable casting down of human pride. Bajazet himself became one of the household instances in all men's mouths, of the instability of the loftiest fortune. His power seemed to break in pieces and dissolve—its instruments and its seats were swept away under the hoofs of the Tartar horses. And when the tempest which had carried him along with it had passed over, Ottoman was ranged against Ottoman, Janissary against Spahi, while his sons tore among themselves what remained of the Ottoman dominions, and fought with one another for its ruins. Yet out of this wreck of public calamity and domestic war, the institutions of Orchan emerged unimpaired in form, and unaltered in spirit; the tenacious and elastic strength of his race rapidly recovered and collected itself; and from the confusion and disasters of that house, which seemed not only beaten down but divided against itself, arose in terrible energy and relentless purpose, the awful form of Mahomet the Conqueror.

A primitive and severe simplicity of habits had hitherto marked the Ottoman sovereigns. Unscrupulous in policy, reckless of blood, and fierce in their scorn of those whom they had destined for their slaves, they were yet largely imbued with what religious tempers the Koran can infuse; it speaks much of kindness and mercy to the needy, and of rigorous justice even to the stranger; and they had gained renown even among their enemies for both. Nor, while displaying magnificence in their public constructions and foundations, had they yet been tempted to leave their ancestral homeliness, and copy the barbaric gorgeousness of Oriental state. Once only a whim of Amurath prompted him to add a slight ornament to the severe plainness of his attire. At the plunder of a town he discovered and exposed

the device of one of his soldiers, to secrete a golden cup, by placing it on his head, and covering it with his head-dress; Amurath chose to be amused at the trick, and in his merriment to imitate the soldier, and set the fashion of wearing a gold embroidered cap beneath the white linen of his turban. And his illiterate rudeness, ostentatiously affected, if it was not real, is still commemorated in the *Tughra* or sign manual of his more polished successors—the Arabic letters of their name and style are interwoven into a rude outline of the impression of a human hand, in remembrance of the way in which Amurath, like the shepherd kings of Tartary, the Mongol conquerors, and Timour, ratified his treaties, by dipping his palm into the ink, and leaving the print of it on the instrument. But under Bajazet, the effect was seen of unbroken and marvellous success, of increasing wealth and strength, on natures still steeped in the ignorance, and instinct with the savage and untamed wildness, of the steppes of Central Asia. The pride and the dazzling pomp, the cold deliberate ferocity, the monstrous lust of blood, the deep insolent perfidy, the foul and unnameable sensuality, thinly disguised under a veil of grave and manly courtesy, which have marked almost every Ottoman sovereign, and certainly every period of Ottoman power, appear already in their hateful combination, if not yet in their full proportions, in the Court of Bajazet.

‘The reign of Bajazet Ilderim, “the Thunderbolt,”’ says Von Hammer, ‘begins, like the history of the world, with fratricide. Scarcely had his father breathed forth his spirit, than Bajazet ordered his brother to be put to death’—the brother who had shared with him, the day before, the perils and the toil of the hard-fought field of Kossova. ‘He did this,’ says the official historiographer of the Ottoman empire, Seadeddin, who proclaims it his duty only to record the facts which set forth the honour of the noble house of Othman—he did this ‘in consideration of the text of the Koran, “Disturbance is worse than putting to death:”—in consideration of the evil example given by his brother Saudschi of conspiracy and rebellion, that such an example might not find an imitator:—and in consideration of the example which ought to be followed, of God, who is alone, and without a rival; wherefore also the shadow of God upon earth, the Ruler of the Faithful, ought, like God, to govern on his throne without companionship and without rivalry.’ ‘The reasons which influenced Bajazet,’ continues Von Hammer, ‘were found so weighty by the succeeding sultans, that his example was followed as a rule; and afterwards, in the legislation of Mahommed the Conqueror, the murder of the brethren of the Sultan was publicly proclaimed to be the law of the kingdom.’ The vassalage of the Servians, and other Slavonian tribes,

which followed on the battle of Kossova, gave Bajazet an undisputed preeminence in the East; but the rout and massacre of Nicopolis at once spread his name and terror throughout Europe. In the most disastrous days of the Crusades, the pride of the nobles of the West had not been taught so terrible a lesson by the Infidels of Asia. A momentary pause in the confusions of the Great Schism, and the civil wars of France, had left them free to seek the excitement of an Eastern adventure. At Pentecost in 1396, a gay and princely company met at Vienna, whom Sigismund of Hungary, the future emperor of Germany, had invited to accompany him to chastise the hordes which were riding along the Danube, and to sweep them out of Christendom. In it were heard some of the most famous names and noblest titles of France, Burgundy, and Flanders: D'Eu, De la Marche, and Bar, belonged to the blood royal of France; St. Pol, De la Trémouille, Sampi, and De Couci, to its most high-born lordly houses; John de Vienne, the Admiral,—John Boucicaut, the Marshal of France, were captains renowned in the wars and councils of the West; the men-at-arms and squires, whom they brought with them, were picked men of the tried and fiery knighthood of their gallant land; at their head was a grandson of France and heir of Burgundy, known then as the Count of Nevers, but afterwards as *Jean sans Peur*,<sup>1</sup> reserved to be the father of mighty princes,—to be the troubler and scourge of his country,—to be able to daunt a council of the Church from condemning the doctrine of tyrannicide, and ruin the greatest theologian of his age, John Gerson, for denouncing it,—and to end and expiate his guilty and blood-stained life, by being himself its victim on the bridge of Montereau. Nor were the noble names of Germany absent. A Hohen-Zollern led knights from the Rhine; the Count Palatine, from Bavaria; Herman of Cilli, from Styria; and with them was the Grand Master of Rhodes, and a numerous company of the Knights of St. John. On St. Michael's eve, they met the foes they had come to seek on the Danube. Headstrong and insolent, 'despising their enemies and their allies,' scorning the caution prompted by Sigismund's dearly-bought experience of Turkish war, confident in their mail of proof and their western spears, they rose up from their wine and debauchery, and the perfidious slaughter of their captives, to look for and ride down the Infidel rabble rout<sup>2</sup> who had terrified the East.

<sup>1</sup> When the Count de Nevers was brought before Bajazet, after the battle of Nicopolis, 'disoit-on communement, qu'il y eut un Sarrasin, nommé Nigromancien, devin, ou sorcier, qui dist qu'on le sauvast, et qu'il estoit taillé de faire mourir plus de Chrestiens que le Basac (Bajazet), ny tous ceux de leur loy ne saurarent faire.'—Juvenal des Ursins, 1396.

<sup>2</sup> 'Cette chiensaille.'—Mém. de Boucicaut, c. xxv.

They encountered a well-ordered and well-prepared army, whose warlike and brilliant show equalled their own. A swarm of light-horsemen covered the Ottoman lines, and concealed what they were doing. As the French advanced, the light-horsemen swept off right and left like a dispersing cloud, and disclosed, behind a fence of thickly-planted stakes, which had been fixed under the cover of their skirmishing, a long line of infantry, from whom a storm of arrows poured into the faces of the French cavalry. But through the deadly arrow-flights, through the barrier of sharp and slanting stakes, among which men and horses were maimed, they pushed on in spite of great loss; then, before their thundering onset and levelled spears, even the Janissaries, who never fled, were broken and overthrown. The first line of their enemies was destroyed, and the horsemen, who had taken refuge behind it, scattered; but the French could not halt, and a second line of stout and fierce infantry awaited them. As riders and horses, in disorder and out of breath, mounted the crest of a rising ground, they came upon Bajazet, and with him, not on the wreck and remains, but on the masses, fresh and untouched, of the main body of his host. At once, a 'forest of lances' closed round the loose array and exhausted strength of that troop of knights. They fought fiercely and terribly in their despair, but they could charge no longer; they were hemmed in, entangled, jammed together, stifled, by the surging throng and press of the storming Turkish squadrons. They were crushed and broken down, says the report of one who saw the scene, 'like the iron on the anvil.'<sup>1</sup> The Hungarians, far behind, and panic-struck, when they saw the French cavalry struggling in the toils,—led also, it is said, by faithless generals,—broke and fled. But Sigismund's guards, with the soldiers from Bavaria and Styria, yet formed a strong and formidable body, and advanced to extricate and relieve their comrades. They, too, were at first successful, till a fierce onset on their flank overthrew them. Sigismund, when his royal banner was struck down, escaped, with a few companions, by means of a small boat, on the Danube. But the Christian host was no more; and those of the French and German nobles who were not lying on the field, were prisoners in the hands of Bajazet. On the morrow came a more dreadful scene. Bajazet was furious at the massacre of the Turkish captives by the French nobles, and at his losses on the field. Sitting at his tent door, he ordered the whole body of prisoners to be collected from every part of the camp before him. Two of those who were present and escaped,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Mém. de Boucicaut.*

have left behind their remembrances of that day of humiliation and blood.<sup>1</sup> The 'noble youths of the Fleur-de-Lys,' honoured and high-spirited children of the lineage and royal blood of France, were tied tightly with cords by the 'ugly and horrible Saracens,' who held them with 'hard and rough grasp before the tyrant as he sat.' He granted their lives to the Count de Nevers, and twenty-four of his noblest companions, and bade them sit on the ground at his feet. Then he ordered the whole number of the remaining prisoners to be slain before him. They were brought up one by one, or stood in lines, as they were tied; and the club, or the sharp heavy yataghan,<sup>2</sup> passed along from head to head. The number of the victims varies, in different accounts, from three hundred to ten thousand; but one of our informants, an eye-witness, the German Schildberger, who was saved by the son of Bajazet for his extreme youth, and returned an old man to Nuremberg to write the story of that horrible morning, says, that at sun-rise the work of death began, and that when it was stopped, at the entreaties of the Turkish chiefs, wearied and sickened of its horrors, it was already four hours after noon. As Boucicaut, the Marshal of France, approached in the sad procession, and his turn was rapidly drawing near, his eyes met those of the Count de Nevers.<sup>3</sup> The Count cast a piteous look at Bajazet, and joined the fingers of his hands, to signify that Boucicaut was as a brother to him. Bajazet understood the sign, and Boucicaut was spared, to share the count's captivity, and, at last, after losing once more his liberty in a more famous battle than even Nicopolis, to die a prisoner in England.<sup>4</sup> Such was the end of that gallant company. At Pentecost they had met at Vienna. On Christmas night, while the gay court of the King of France was holding a brilliant festival at Paris, a horseman, booted and spurred, rode into the Hotel S. Pol, and kneeling before the king, delivered the message, that the corpses of the French host were lying unburied on the banks of the Danube,<sup>5</sup> and that the few survivors, and among them five princes of his own race, were waiting for their ransom in the prisons of Brusa. France and Flanders were thrown into mourning. And the first of those degrading tributes of money and presents, with which the great kings of the West used, from time to time, to deprecate the hostility and

<sup>1</sup> Schildberger and Boucicaut; supposing that the writer of Boucicaut's Memoirs had the account from himself, which is probable. Cf. *Notice sur Boucicaut*, (Collection Michaud et Poujoulat,) ii. p. 212.

<sup>2</sup> 'Grands cousteaux.'—Boucicaut.

<sup>3</sup> 'Dieu feit, que le Comte de Nevers, sur le point que on vouloit ferir sur luy le va regarder moult piteusement, et le mareschal luy.'—Boucicaut.

<sup>4</sup> Gibbon kills him at Agincourt; but it is a mistake. Cf. *Notice sur Boucicaut*, p. 212.

<sup>5</sup> Juvenal des Ursins. 1396.

feed the insolence of the Turks, was offered at the Porte of Bajazet by the most ancient royal house in Christendom, to redeem the captives of Nicopolis.

For twelve years nothing interrupted the uniform course of Bajazet's conquests. In Asia he finished what his predecessors had begun, the reunion under one sway of all the fragments of the old Seljouk kingdom. The principalities of the coast were finally extinguished. Karaman was conquered, and its chief put to death; and from the shores of Cilicia, Bajazet turned to those of the Euxine, to punish and dispossess the Isfendiars of Kastemuni, the lords of old Paphlagonia, for having harboured the fugitive princes of the *Ægean* coasts. The shelterers were driven from Sinope and Amasia, as the sheltered had been driven from Smyrna and Ephesus, to seek and raise up an avenger, in the midst of that dark tempest of desolating conquest, which was raging in the depth of Asia, and in which a mightier than Bajazet was drawing near, amid the ruins of the kingdoms of the East. Nothing daunted by the portentous renown of Timour, Bajazet advanced eastwards, till the northern Euphrates became his border. In Europe, Servia, and Wallachia, were his tributaries. His fortified posts on the Danube were pushed upwards to Widdin, and the Turkish marauders began to feel their way into the unexplored lands of Hungary and Styria. Southwards, he plunged into Thessaly and Greece, offended with the Greek emperor, or in search of new hunting-grounds;<sup>1</sup> the instigator and guide of his march was a Greek and a churchman, the traitor Bishop of Phocis. This time there was no one to defend Thermopylæ, and Bajazet received the homage of the Greek and Frankish chiefs who ruled in Phocis and Bœotia; while the unwearied Evrenos, that implacable old man against his former race and faith, who, under Amurath, had firmly fixed the Ottoman horsetails on the banks of the Macedonian Axius, now carried them forward over the unguarded Isthmus, to the citadel of Argos and the waters of the Gulf of Coron. In this visitation—for it was not yet a conquest—Athens was not spared: and though the Ottomans for the present retired, they swept off with them a booty of 30,000 slaves, whom they fixed as a colony in Asia, in the same way as they had planted Asiatic colonies at the gates of Constantinople, and in the plains of Thrace.

If Bajazet judged of the nations of the West from his past experience of the spirit and wisdom of his Christian foes, it is easy to understand the words of scorn and menace, with which he is said to have dismissed his prisoners.<sup>2</sup> For in

<sup>1</sup> Finlay; Von Hammer.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gibbon, chap. lxiv. p. 72.



the East, he had not only conquered the Christians,—he had forced them to fight his battles against their fellow-Christians, not in the ranks of the Janissaries merely, but under their own banner of the Cross. The charge which finally crushed the Christian host at Nicopolis, was made by Christian troops led by the Christian chief of Servia, the son of him who had been slaughtered in Amurath's tent at Kossova, the grandson of Stephen Dushan, but now the brother-in-law and sworn liegeman of Bajazet. For the Palæologi at Constantinople a lower depth of infamy was reserved. It was not only, that Bajazet made and unmade Cæsars at his pleasure,—deposed, imprisoned, and then caused the occupant of the throne and the dungeon to change places again; it was not only, that he compelled them to receive a Mahometan kadi, and to allow a Mahometan mosque to be built within the imperial city,—it was not only, that when the Emperors had pulled down three famous churches to fill up a gap in the ruined city walls, they submissively obeyed his prohibition to add any new fortifications to Constantinople, and razed to the ground, at his order, what they had just built; it was not only, that the smallest disobedience was at once punished by a strict and prolonged blockade—the ignominy of the Greek emperors yet wanted something to complete it. A single Greek city, which had stood the brunt of more than one fierce storm, still raised itself above the ruins of the empire. Alascher, the ancient Philadelphia, was a great staple of trade, and, in the very heart of the Turkish conquests, was still a free town. Bajazet wanted lands and houses, to form the endowment of his new mosque at Adrianople; and he led his army against Philadelphia. The Greek vassal emperors, with their troops, were with him. It was Manuel, the Greek emperor, who summoned Philadelphia to receive the Turkish yoke. When Philadelphia resolved to defend its freedom, it was the Greek emperors and Greek soldiers who were appointed, and who undertook, to conduct the siege. Lastly—what would be beyond belief, if a Greek chronicler<sup>1</sup> had not related it—‘*it was John and Manuel, the Greek emperors, who led the assault against their own city, to deliver it into the hands of the barbarians.*’<sup>2</sup>

The shadows of ancient greatness still lingered and flitted in its decaying palaces, or wandered, unhonoured suppliants, with their piteous tale of woe and shame, among the courts of the West; or in ludicrous mockery of their fallen state, emulously multiplied themselves in the still shrinking limits of their narrow corner in Thrace, and contending Cæsars reigned, not

<sup>1</sup> Chalcocondylas.<sup>2</sup> Von Hammer, i. 185.

only at Constantinople, but a score of miles off, at Selymbria. But the substance of power in what was wont to be considered the Eastern world, was in Bajazet's court, the Sultan's Gate, at Brusa. Bajazet had traversed the countries from Germany to Armenia, from the Carpathians to Persia and the Syrian desert, and had not yet found a rival; and now he stood, careless of the wild storm which was bursting over Asia, only waiting to arise and be the scourge of the sins and divisions, the scandals and confusions, of Western Christendom. And under him was now seen at Brusa, not only the substance but the show of a power, which served itself of the wealth and strength of many races of men. The Ottomans had long been rapacious—had long been overbearing—had long been insolent: they now exhibited, in rapid and premature development, the display and the corruption of secure prosperity. The profuse and pompous magnificence, and the greediness after money at the expense of public interest and private honour, which are such prominent features in almost all the great men of the Ottomans, began to show themselves in the reign of Bajazet. The son of the great Black Halil, Bajazet's chief minister and friend, was not above receiving a bribe from the Greek Emperor, to give a respite to Constantinople. Bajazet's glory and show in the hunting-field were the wonder of his French captives, the kinsmen of the gayest and of the wealthiest of European princes; but the fiery Bajazet, whose joy seemed the battle, and who owed his fame and his power to his army, left his soldiers without pay at the very crisis of his fortune, and grudged his treasures to them, even in the moment of peril, with the close-handed and shortsighted thrift of a miserly usurer. We still hear, indeed, of Ottoman justice; but Bajazet's, if we are to judge from the well-known stories<sup>1</sup> which illustrate it, was but the blind ferocity of a provoked barbarian. What is more certain than Bajazet's justice is the licentiousness, of which he gave the example and became the precedent. Bajazet, the first of the Ottoman princes, gave the rein to his wild nature, in pleasure as well as in ambition or revenge. A Moslem prince, he learnt from one of his Christian wives, and added to the sensuality of Asia, the drunken orgies of the West. But this was the least. It was in Bajazet's court that the seeds were sown, which took root so early and grew with the growth of the Ottoman State, of that unnameable system of public and unexampled profligacy—which remains to this day its burning and characteristic shame, and its incurable curse—that system of official promotion, which made the infamy

<sup>1</sup> See Gibbon, chap. lxiv. ; vol. viii. p. 68.

of youth the ordinary path to the honours of manhood, and to the first places of the State. It was one of the immediate fruits of the policy, which led the Ottomans to recruit their strength in the families of the Christians they had conquered. The tribute of Christian children, not only filled the chambers of the Janissaries with recruits, but the Sultan's halls with pages. It is reported that the heinous taint which spread from the Court involved all the orders and classes, by whom the Ottoman State was supported and guided; and that foremost among the corrupt and the corrupting, were not merely all-powerful viziers and lawless soldiers, but the grave and solemn teachers and ministers of the Mahomedan law.<sup>1</sup>

'Bajazet sat at Brusa,' says one of the Greek chroniclers, in his flowery style, 'and the lofty tree of his prosperity was laden with fruit. Nothing of all the things which can give most exquisite enjoyment was wanting to him. Wild beasts of strange shapes, precious metals, and all that God has created most rare for the delight of the eyes, were found in his treasure houses. Choicest slaves, men and women, of fair form and beautiful countenance, stood round him—they were Greeks, Servians, Wallachians, Albanians, Hungarians, Saxons, Bulgarians, Latins—who all sang and made music, each in their own language, however little heart they might have for it. But he sat in the midst of them, and gave himself up without interruption to the enjoyment of soft voluptuousness.'<sup>2</sup>

One thing only impeached the perfect splendour of his prosperity. At his very gates, enclosed and straitened by his ample conquests, the ruins and spoils of its worn-out empire, a great and venerable name still claimed the honours of twenty centuries, and maintained its precedence among Eastern princes, by the possession of a royal city, which seemed the symbol and pledge of Eastern dominion. True, Bajazet had held its keys; he had changed its rulers; he had put it to tribute; he had led forth its Cæsars among his other vassals, against their own less compliant towns. But it was not less true, that the lord still sat at Brusa, and the vassal in the imperial palaces of Constantinople; it was not less true, that the owner of Constantinople was, in the view, not only of Western princes and Western merchants, but of Bajazet's own subjects, the rightful Emperor of the East. And under Bajazet's own eyes, that single but splendid relic of greatness, itself more than half the empire, had been transferred without his leave, from one to another, by the helpless pretenders to the name of Cæsar; and when one of them could no longer hold it, he devolved his right, and united

<sup>1</sup> Von Hammer, i. 192.<sup>2</sup> Ducas, in Von Hammer, i. 209.

the rival diadems of Selymbria and Constantinople, on the head of a blind and feeble pensioner of the Ottoman conqueror. The 'sick man's heritage,' according to the memorable phrase of modern days, invited the hand of his successor. Orchan and Amurath had each successively added a nobler capital to their dominions. It seemed reserved for Bajazet to outshine their exploits, and accomplish their work, by raising up the 'Gate' and throne of the Turcoman lords of the 'Black Castle,' within the precincts of the palace of the Cæsars, and by having the weekly prayer of the Moslems recited in his own name, and to the honour of the Arabian Prophet, in the oldest Cathedral in Christendom.

It seemed the triumph reserved for Bajazet; and in the first year of the fifteenth century he prepared to claim it. The blind John of Selymbria reigned in Constantinople, while his cousin and rival Manuel was vainly imploring help among the courts of Europe. Bajazet sent to John: 'Not for thy sake, but for my own,' he said, 'have I cast out thy predecessor. Art thou our friend?—then remove from the city, and choose thee a province where thou wilt, and I will bestow it on thee to govern. But if not, I swear by God, and our Prophet, that I will spare no one. All shall utterly perish.'

As at the last, when the last *did* arrive, so now, when it seemed come,—a burst of brave resolution flashed up in the moment of utmost peril, amid the decay and ignominy of the Greek race. Constantinople sent back an answer worthy of her history and name, to the summons of the barbarian: 'Go tell your master,' said its people, 'that we are indeed without help. We have no defender, to whose might we can look for protection, except God—God, who upholds the helpless, and overthrows the strong. Now do thy pleasure.' And they and their proud enemy prepared for the encounter.

But the encounter was not to be. That generation was to be sleeping in its graves, before the change, which seemed at the very doors, should come; they were to be spared the shame, or denied the triumph, of seeing a new dynasty enthroned on the Golden Horn. The crash of a tremendous revolution was, indeed, to startle the world; but it was the downfall of its most rising power, not the extinction of one long doomed to ruin.

Bajazet was called away from Constantinople to meet the challenge of a rival conqueror, of his own faith and stock, but one before whose terrible ambition and greatness Bajazet is dwarfed and overshadowed, and his broad Ottoman realm dwindles down into the dimensions of a province. Timour was the last and the most remarkable of those Tartar wan-

dérers, in whom the boundless and lawless liberty of the Steppes awakened the dream of the mastery of the world; who, driven onwards by a frenzied and devouring enthusiasm that could not stop, and bursting by their grim energy through all that barred their way, were able for a time to bind the civilization of Asia to the throne of the Northern wilderness: and who, even after that throne had crumbled, left indelible traces of their character, their deeds and thoughts, on the memory, the history, and the legislation of the polished races of the South. Timour held the conquerors' spell over his savage brethren. Lured by that spell from their bleak, endless plains, and forbidding wastes, their roaming camps were once more gathered together for battle, under a chief who was able to break them to his discipline, and bend them as one man to the single aim of his vast ambition. Once more, and for the last time, the Mongol war cry of '*forwards*'<sup>1</sup> passed from land to land, across the Oxus, across the Volga, across the Euphrates, across the Indus, and at last across the Halys. About the time that Amurath the Victorious led the Ottomans into Europe, Timour began to conquer. While they had been advancing from the Hellespont to the Danube and the Euphrates, Timour had dashed to pieces power after power, from the deserts of Tartary to those of Arabia, from the shores of the Caspian to the fountains of the Ganges; he went onward, where Alexander and Genghis had turned back; the historic lands of Asia, the seats of her proudest kingdoms, the cradles and homes of her highest civilization—Persia and Chaldæa, Armenia and Hindostan—were joined in a common wreck with the barbarian thrones of Turkistan and Russia, to form a Tartar empire; over their impregnable fortresses, their fairest and greatest cities, Ispahan, Bagdad, Delhi, Damascus, his sword had passed, like the lightning or the pestilence, and left them without man or beast, marked by their reeking walls and pyramids of human skulls;—spoiled, that by their arts and industry Samarcand might be adorned; ruined, that Samarcand might be left standing alone, the one great city of the Tartar reign; while during the forty years that his armies traversed to and fro, and his horse-hoofs marked the soil, the lands of civilized man—of those who are nourished by the wheatsheaf, the vine, and the olive—tilth and garden, orchard and watered meadow, seemed yielding to the encroachments of his native steppe, to furnish hunting-grounds for his game, or unpeopled pastures for the horses and flocks, whose flesh and milk were the food of his race. The perfect and favourite number of the Tartars, nine, had been all but fulfilled

<sup>1</sup> 'Sürün.' Von Hammer, i. 223, 249.

and multiplied in the dynasties he had annihilated, and the crowns he had united on his head; *almost* nine princely houses, thrice nine separate lands, were reckoned when he told the sum of his conquests,—one more great family was wanting to complete the tale, when he marched against Bajazet; and the dynasty of the Ottomans made the ninth.

Such was the fierce destroyer of men, whom Bajazet had now to meet; a grimly earnest, lame old man, with long white hair, hair which had been white from his infancy, flowing from his massy head and open brow,<sup>1</sup>—a man who hated jests and lies,—grave and weighty in his sayings, finding his solace in complicated games of chess, or in discussing with his scheiks abstruse and thorny questions of theology or casuistry; a man who never forgot, never desisted, never regretted the past or repented of what he had done:—a man before whom the gems and gold of Asia had been showered, and who had all its glories and delights at his command; yet after nearly half a century of war and victory—war almost without a break, and victory without a reverse—was neither enervated nor wearied:—who was to go on till his last breath, conquering, planning, and building up with restless and sagacious energy—whose organizing mind had covered Asia with a network of rapid communications and watchful intelligencers, and had introduced obedience, subordination, a regular array and equipment, and a method of systematic and well-imagined tactics, among his swarming hordes; who spent his life in wasting Asia, yet was full of wise thoughts of statesmanship, and is named as one of the founders and sources of Asiatic law:—a man, merciless as death, to whose horrible butcheries of his Moslem brethren, the bloody morrow of Nicopolis seems but an excusable catastrophe of war; yet who professed the stern piety and benevolence of the Koran, who deigned to disclaim the character of a man of blood, and to throw the burden of what he had shed on his enemies; and who, in the height of his pride, took pleasure in contrasting the magnificence of his fortune with his crippled body, and in ostentatiously confessing that in all that he had achieved or won, he felt himself but the frail and feeble instrument of the hand of God.

Nearly forty years before, Ottomans and Mongols had each gone on their way to conquer; at the end of that time they met. It was but natural that the conqueror, who had spared no Mahometan house or kingdom, and who had been driven by the frenzy of universal dominion to the plains of India and the wastes of Russia, should refuse to turn back from any boundary that his horses could overleap or swim. Yet Timour does

<sup>1</sup> Von Hammer, i. 212.



appear to have been indisposed to break in on the territories of the Ottomans. He came, and marked his coming by the destruction of a great city, and then turned away; and Bajazet seems to have wantonly tempted and drawn aside the tempest from its path. At any rate, if the shock must have come, and his last and proudest crown had still to be won by Timour, either by voluntary homage or war, he was not suffered to want a pretext by the insolence of Bajazet. Irritating messages and words of scorn were exchanged by both; but the pride of Timour was dignified and self-possessed, compared with the furious and frantic defiance of the most sacred laws of Eastern right and courtesy, which Bajazet displayed to the ambassadors and the personal honour of Timour. 'The son of Murad is mad,' he said, when the last insult that an Oriental can offer or endure was cast in his face; and he gave the decisive order to go forward against Anatolia. Bajazet, who had the city of the Cæsars in his grasp, who had been dreaming of planting his horsetails even in their Western seat, could only be brought to look upon Timour as an adventurous and lucky freebooter of the desert. His soldiers were murmuring for their pay, and he refused to open his treasures. His chiefs warned him of the numbers of the invading cavalry, and urged him to avoid the plains and occupy the passes and the hills; but his only care was to find and exterminate them in open battle. He hastened to the frontier. They too were hastening on; they swept forward, and passed him far on his flank; and when he had lost their trace, and was waiting for them to appear, he heard of them many marches behind him. They were between him and his capital, assailing the great fortress of Angora which defends the road. He had to seek them once more in the very heart of his dominions. This time they did not disappoint him. He found the Tartar host well posted, entrenched, and ready. In the infatuation of his pride, to exhibit before their eyes his scorn of their power, he exhausted his already wearied soldiers with the vainglorious spectacle of an Oriental hunting-party. The Tartars, meanwhile, were busy in cutting off or spoiling the water-springs by which the Ottomans were supplied. Then came the day of battle. It would be a perilous attempt to estimate the numbers on an eastern battle-field, described by eastern chroniclers. But there can be no doubt that many years had passed, since a muster and a shock, like that of the Mongol and Ottoman powers on the plains of Angora, had been witnessed in the East. There, in Bajazet's line of battle, were arrayed—Christians and Moslems once more together—the conquerors of Nicopolis; on the left, Stephen, with his black Servian cuirassiers, who had broken the last reserves of the Hungarian army; and in

the centre the compact and stubborn lines of the Janissaries. But on Bajazet's right, were masses of the unsteady and discontented troops of Asia, whose hereditary princes were in the camp of Timour, and Tartar colonists from Thrace, won over by Timour's emissaries to the side of their former kinsmen. A stately array of elephants is said to have formed the van of Timour's army; but his real strength was the broad and open plain. There his overwhelming numbers found space and play for the unrelaxing impetuosity of their successive charges. They overlapped, they tore asunder the Ottoman line; they surrounded, they burst, in repeated assaults, on its divided fragments. Large bodies of the Asiatic troops, with the Tartar auxiliaries, went over to Timour. The Servian horsemen fought hard and dangerously, but they were wedged together by swarming throngs, as the French knights had been at Nicopolis, and perished as they did. Stephen, on his barbed war-horse, broke through the press, and made his way to where Bajazet had retired to a rising ground, and with the impenetrable and unshaken Janissaries maintained the conflict, when it had ceased everywhere else. Stephen urged Bajazet to escape, but he refused. Despair or hope still bound him to that fated field, where his bravest and his dearest dared not abide with their master and father. All fled before the inevitable ruin—chiefs like Stephen and Evrenos, officers like the Grand Vizier, the Aga of the Janissaries, the Captain of the Horse-guards—his surviving sons, each as chance opened a way through the Tartars, one westward to Europe, another eastward to the Pontic mountains, another southward to the crags of Taurus. But all day long, from morning to nightfall, under the blazing July sun,<sup>1</sup> the Janissaries, faint with thirst, and falling fast under the Tartar onslaughts, held on without flinching, for the last chance of retrieving their master's fortune; and he held on with them. But that fortune, so dazzling and so unchequered, had that day run out its term. Night came down on his thinned and sinking footmen, and he saw that on the field there was nothing more to be done. He was persuaded to mount and fly. But beyond the spears of the Janissaries, the Tartar horsemen were masters of the plain. His horse stumbled or stopped to drink; and he was taken. The titular head of the royal tribe of the Mongols, the lineal heir of Genghis, now a vassal chief in the Tartar host, led the Sultan of the Ottomans to the tent of his conqueror.

It is credible, and quite consonant with Eastern feelings, and with Timour's character, that he was received with proud and grave courtesy. When Timour's fury had spent itself, he was the

<sup>1</sup> 20th July, 1402.

man to eye curiously and moralize with irony on the monument before him of the strange mixtures and alternations in man's lot. He made Bajazet, it is related, seat himself on the carpet next himself, and conversed with him on the incidents of the fight. Then he allowed his thoughts to flow, on that mighty share of power which he had that day confirmed, and which Bajazet had the same day forfeited. 'Thou and I,' he said, 'owe great and special thanks to God the Lord, for the dominion which he has granted to us.' 'Why so?' said the prisoner. 'Because he has divided it between two such people as we—a lame man like me, and a gouty one like you: to the lame man he has given all from India to Sivas, and to the gouty one all from Sivas to Hungary. Surely this leaves no doubt, what the dominion of the world is worth in the eyes of God. If it had not been less than nothing, he would have shared it between men sound of body and whole of limb, not between a pair of cripples, like you and me. But because thou hast been unthankful to God, and not acknowledged His benefits, He has sent this chastisement by *my* hand, the rod of His anger. Yet take it not to heart, brother Bajazet. If a man keeps but safe and sound, he soon comes back to fortune and blessing.' But the words of the conqueror, jesting in the moment of triumph with his own prosperity, are no real proof of the clemency or generosity of the man. Modern criticism has indeed changed the *iron cage* into a closed and latticed litter, and traced the origin of a world-wide story to a confusion between two like-sounding words. But Bajazet was impatient of captivity, and Timour was resolved to display his captive in the streets of Samarcand. The harshness of the imprisonment no doubt increased, as the prisoner tried to break from it. And the natural scorn of the strong and unrelenting barbarian, for what he had overthrown and ruined, for the helplessness which was before his eyes every day, soon broke out and overrode all temporary sentiment about the vanity of human greatness. Bajazet had been a passionate and famous hunter: Timour sent him a present of hounds and hawks, to mock him with the remembrances of his days of freedom. And more than this, the women of Bajazet's harem, and even one of his legitimate wives, were dragged forth in public at the Tartar's banquet, and forced to serve wine to his guests. Bajazet was carried about in Timour's train, as he slowly turned back to Samarcand. But he died in Asia Minor, before the year of his captivity was out. 'God's we are,' said Timour, 'and to God we return,' when he was told of Bajazet's death; and four days after, he received, with the same words, the announcement of the death of his own favourite grandson. He gave Bajazet's remains to his son Musa; and his tomb was raised like

those of his fathers, by the mosque which he had built, amid the groves and rushing waters of Brusa. Yet one more humiliation, the last that man, and the bitterest that Moslem can go through, was reserved to complete the reversal of his fortune. Alone of all the Ottoman princes, the proud and brilliant Bajazet was not allowed his last rest, amid the great dead of his line and race. In the confusion which followed his death, a chief of Karaman, of that family which Bajazet had crushed and disinherited, was able to take vengeance for the misfortunes of his house, in the city and at the grave of their destroyer; and in Brusa, Bajazet's chosen seat of glory and delight, his tomb was violated and overthrown, his corpse torn up, burnt, and its ashes scattered, that it might never again be restored to its resting-place, to give a savage triumph to a spiteful rebel.

Athens after Syracuse, Rome after Cannæ, France after Waterloo, were not so shattered and laid low as the Ottoman state was after the rout of Angora. Just a hundred years before, it had begun to be. In the first years of the fourteenth century, Othman became an independent chief, in an obscure castle on the borders of Bithynia. In the first years of the fifteenth, his descendants were crushed under the iron might of Timour. In the interval they had achieved an empire. And now it seemed as if the course of their empire were run, like that of so many fortunate and short-lived Asiatic dynasties; that the time was come for it to fall in pieces, and give place to another, or be frittered away in the hands of a number of quarrelsome and impotent local chiefs. For half a century the event seemed to hang in the balance. Desperate efforts, perilous struggles, compliances, submissions, and yieldings to the time, which would have provoked the indignation of Orchan and the first Amurath, marked the period; one hard and anxious trial of strength came at its close; and then the Ottoman power emerged, compact, invincible, and more terrible than before, to resume its career and accomplish its strange destiny, and long confront, with threatening and with scorn, the greatest and strongest politics of the rising civilization of Western Christendom.

The Tartar hordes pushed westwards till they were stopped by the broad Hellespont and the Ægean. They spoiled Brusa and its treasures, and burnt its mosques and schools; a storm and a massacre left Smyrna in ruins and blood; and then the devastating wave swept backwards, from the provinces over which it had broken, to roll to the other extremity of Asia, and menace China. But before Timour had departed, all humbled themselves before him, and acknowledged his supremacy. Soleiman, the son of Bajazet, safe behind the sea in his palace at Adrianople, yet asked and received the investiture of the

lordship of the Ottomans and of the kingdom of Roum, in a charter impressed with the print of the red hand of the Mongol.<sup>1</sup> Timour, it is said, had graciously received the prayer of Bajazet, that he would not root out his posterity, nor utterly destroy a race which was the bulwark and hope of the Moslems. From the Cæsar of Constantinople he received, before he departed, the tribute of the conquered—from the Sultan of Egypt, the submission of a vassal; and in the mosques and mints of Cairo, prayer was said, and coin struck, in the imperial name of Timour. The consolidating work of the Ottoman conquerors in Asia Minor was broken up and thrown back for many years. The Turkish principalities, which had been fused together under their sway, were again divided under their restored dynasties; and Timour left the Ottomans of Brusa, once more, what they had been under their first Emir, but one among the fragments of the Seljouk kingdom.

All had to be begun again in the Ottoman State; and *it did* begin again with a fierce war of succession, among the sons of Bajazet, whom the overthrow of Angora had hurled apart, to different parts of his ruined dominions. There still survived the emblem and the refuge of the unity of the State, in the court and capital of Adrianople. There, the 'Gate' of the house of Othman was secure from the assaults of the Tartars, and had not much to fear from the neighbouring dynasty of Constantinople. There, were collected, also, the great officers and chiefs, who had served it so zealously, who had witnessed its greatness, and hoped in its fortune, who were imbued with its spirit, and knew its traditions—the Grand Vizier, Black Halil's son,—Evrenos, the great chief of Macedonia, an old man of well nigh a hundred years, yet unabated in energy and keenness, who had, as a Christian, defended Brusa against Orchan, and had lived to accompany Bajazet, as a Moslem, to his ruin at Angora;—Michal-Ogli, the descendant of the first renegade companion of Othman;—the Aga of the Janissaries, the captain of the horse-guards, and the heads of the law; there, also, were the remains, or the reserves, of the Janissaries, and their schools; and to the prince who ruled at Adrianople, the Turkish feudatories of Europe looked up as to their master and liege-lord. There was the nucleus of the empire, and there, in fact, it was saved. But who the prince should be, who was to rule at Adrianople, was long uncertain. Strength and success are better tests than priority of birth, among the Ottomans, of the right of inheritance; and twice the veteran servants of the empire at Adrianople

<sup>1</sup> Instead of a signature or a seal, Timour, according to the Mongol usage, dipped his palm in red ink, and stamped it on the paper. See above, p. 270.

transferred their allegiance to a pretender, who gave the best promise of upholding the fortunes which they had founded with Orchan and Amurath. They deserted Soleiman, an indolent debauchee, for the more energetic Musa; in less than three years after, Evrenos and his companions called in, against the ferocity and oppression of Musa, the tried valour and wise humanity of the prince, who had reconquered a great part of his patrimony in Asia, Mahomet 'the Gentleman.'<sup>1</sup> Mahomet, says a Turkish historian, was the 'Noah who saved the ark of the State amid the deluge of the Tartars.'<sup>2</sup> But Mahomet himself had to maintain his right against another pretended, or perhaps real brother; and to the end of his life he was at war with the spirit of rebellion, which the great break-up of the empire had excited among its vassals, a spirit which he had to leave still unsubdued, to embarrass and keep back the ambition of his successor.

When Manuel Palæologus returned from the West to his capital, which he must have left with scarcely a hope of seeing it again, he found his position strangely altered, towards his dreaded neighbours. They, whom he had left thundering at his gates, had been humbled so low by their reverses, as to beg the help, and make sacrifices for the favour of a Greek emperor. Soleiman had given a son and daughter of Bajazet as hostages for peace, and offered to restore to Manuel the Turkish conquests on the Ægean and the Euxine, from the Strymon to Varna. In the wars of the succession, Manuel was able to throw in a considerable balance on the side he chose. To Manuel, Mahomet was indebted, at least, for the transport of his army to Europe; and when his victory over his brother Musa was secure, he confirmed the agreement of Soleiman, and yielded up to the Emperor the fortresses of Thessaly and of the two seas. 'Tell *my father*,' was the astonishing message of the grandson of Amurath, and the son of Bajazet,—the more astonishing as it was sent in good faith,—'Tell *my father*, the Greek Emperor, *that with his help I have won my paternal kingdom*, that I owe him thanks for this, that henceforth I shall be bound to him as a son to his father, and joyfully do him service.' That a prince of the blood of Othman should have professed to reverence the Cæsar of Constantinople as his father, was strange enough; it was strange that he should have condescended to pay an annual pension to Manuel, for keeping in close custody a pretender to the Ottoman throne; but it was still more strange, that, dying, he should have wished to shield his younger children from the jealousy of his successor, and *their* brother, by solemnly committing them

<sup>1</sup> '*Tchelebi*,' Mahomet's title, is thus translated by Von Hammer.

<sup>2</sup> Von Hammer, i. 281.



to the guardianship of the old enemy, the despised vassal, and long destined victim of his house.

And yet in those days of weakness and peril, when it was wise to adjourn their ambition, and amid the confusion of family quarrels and unceasing intestine war, it is most remarkable to observe in the Ottomans the traits of undamped energy and returning power. Their old dominion gradually stole again over the *Ægean* coasts, and then, with the exception of the *Karamanian* princes, over the rest of *Asia Minor*. *Musa*, during his short reign, was able to recover the boundaries which the Ottomans had possessed before *Bajazet's* fall, beyond the *Morava*, the *Strymon*, and the *Balkan*; and *Mahomet*, though disinclined to war in Europe, in order that he might secure the reduction of *Asia*, yet when he was forced into it, compelled the submission and tribute of *Wallachia*, and built the fortress of *Giurgevo* beyond the *Danube*, to overawe it. *Venice* thought it worth while to negotiate, for the first time, and even after *Loredano's* great victory at *Gallipoli*, to renew, an equal treaty with the Ottomans, during this period of their crippled power. The adorning of their capitals still went on. *Soleiman* began and *Mahomet* finished a magnificent mosque at *Adrianople*; at *Brusa* *Mahomet* finished another, equally famous for its grandeur, which had been begun by *Amurath*; while his own 'Green Mosque,' with its walls incrustated with variegated marbles, and its domes and minarets covered with green porcelain,—together with its adjoining school and almonry, and his own tomb in a garden, similarly faced with tablets of porcelain,—is spoken of as one of the rarest examples of Ottoman taste. It is less surprising, perhaps, that in those troubled days, should be found the earliest gleams, though they seem but faint ones, of Ottoman literature,—of their poetry, their history, and their law.

It is melancholy and humiliating, to contrast with the unshaken purpose and steady recovery of the Ottomans in the most trying crisis of their history, the aimless, low-minded, hopeless policy, without principle, without forethought, without honesty, without courage, of the Christians around them. What were they doing,—those Greeks who had all but seen *Bajazet* change *St. Sophia* into a mosque,—those *Slavonian* races who were threatened with a bondage, which was to rob them of their children, and turn those children into their taskmasters,—those great powers of the West, whose faith and peace were menaced by a power, in whom the ancient fanaticism of the *Saracens* had revived in double strength, and whose life was war—what were they doing, during that unhopd-for and fleeting half century of respite and opportunity? All the world knew why the Ottomans were encamped at *Adrianople*, on the great road from the *Bosphorus* to the valley

of the Danube, looking at once eastward and westward, to Constantinople, and to Venice and Vienna. All the world knew why the Janissaries were instituted; and why the bands of Turkish spoilers beat all the countries, from the Euxine to the Adriatic, for the flower of their children, to feed the schools and recruit the ranks of that hateful company. And what were the Christians doing? They did not even stand by, to let their enemies struggle out of their reverses, as they might. They were making leagues with them, with those who remained of them still on the sacred soil of Europe: they were calling them in, to their own internal quarrels, or taking sides in theirs; they were fighting their battles for them, and aiding the stronger among them to put down the weaker; they were helping them to quell their own discords, and heal their own wounds, and build up once more the strength and unity of their State. But for the Cæsar Manuel, Mahomet could not have found shipping for his army, when he was uniting once more the divided courts of Adrianople and Brusa. But for the Genoese Adorno, Amurath II. could not have been ferried across into Europe to overcome the pretender Mustafa. Stephen of Servia took up the cause and retrieved the fortune, of the fiercest and most dangerous, against the most indolent, of the sons of Bajazet, when no Moslem power would back him; and Servians and Wallachs joined battle with Greeks under the very walls of Constantinople, to determine whether Musa or Soleiman should be the legitimate heir of Othman. Loredano conquered at Gallipoli, only to gain a commercial treaty. In the West, the Popes went on bargaining for a hollow union, extorted from the fears, but retracted again by the indignation of the Greeks: from time to time they faintly repeated the call of more earnest days for a holy war; but no one, in that shrewd and deeply-corrupted age, was moved by what all knew to be the mere cry of feeble selfishness, to dissolve an alliance, or stave off a threatening council. Sigismund of Hungary, the old antagonist of the Ottomans, kept up a border war, and achieved some partial successes, which did not wipe out the memory or repair the disaster of Nicopolis; but he was soon involved in the intrigues of the great schism, the home dangers of the Hussite war, and the anxious issues of the Councils of Constance and Basle. Neither the races whom the Ottomans enslaved, nor Christian Europe which is dishonoured by their presence within her limits, had any right to complain of the shame and the bondage. The final victory of the Ottomans was the fair victory, which resolution, patience, and foresight, will gain in any cause, over indolent or cowardly apathy, which will neither dare, nor endure, nor look forward.

Mahomet the Restorer died before his work was half done. He

died suddenly at Adrianople, when Amurath his eldest son was at the utmost verge of Asia Minor. Once more the succession of Othman's house, that delicate thread on which the life of the Ottoman state—vigorous and tenacious as it was—depended, was in danger. Amurath was summoned with the utmost speed; but the utmost speed could not bring him for many weeks. Mahomet's viziers concealed their master's death. For forty-one days the perilous secret was kept. The soldiers murmured and disbelieved. They insisted on seeing their Sultan. They would listen to no remonstrances of the physicians, and at fearful risk they were successfully cheated. In a closed and darkened kiosk—for the Sultan, it was said, could not bear the air—the corpse of Mahomet was presented to them, seated on his throne, behind a glass door; pages concealed beneath his vestments moved his arms; the soldiers defiling before the door, saluted what seemed the living form of their chief, and their misgivings were satisfied. But Amurath the Second had hardly been girded with the scymitar of Othman, before his right was challenged. Manuel, the Greek emperor, had a pretender in his keeping, who claimed to be the son of Bajazet. Amurath, in spite of his father's will, refused to give up his father's children, the blood of Othman, to the guardianship of a Greek Cæsar; and Manuel let loose the pretender Mustafa. The Ottomans were at once again divided. Mustafa was able to rally to him the sons of Evrenos and the feudal chiefs of Thrace. Beneath the walls of Adrianople, he boldly called on the Janissaries to yield him their allegiance, and his voice and presence were enough to win them over to his side; he was strong enough to insult the Greek emperor, who had been both his gaoler and his ally, and to cross into Asia, and threaten Brusa. There the tide turned against him: as his voice had lured the Janissaries of Adrianople to his side, so the call of their old chieftain Michalogli was known and obeyed in the camp of Mustafa's light horsemen. He was deserted, and escaped to Europe. But Amurath had no ships to follow him. He applied for aid to Manuel; Manuel refused his ships, except in return for the children of Mahomet. Mustafa might have reigned at Adrianople, and Amurath at Brusa, but for the traders of the factories of Genoa. Adorno, the son of a doge of Genoa, proffered his galleys and his soldiers. All was done, as between the heartiest and truest allies—by the Moslem Sultan and the Christian Podestà. The Italian's service was frank and faithful. The Ottoman's acknowledgments were large and princely. Amurath was accompanied by Adorno, with his archers and his black bands of Italian infantry, in his victorious march to Adrianople. Adorno gained for the trade of Genoa a new station on the Ionian coast, and the free

working of the alum mines of Phocæa; and enjoyed, unmolested, during his lifetime, the tolls and profits of its custom-house.

The spirit of revolt was not quelled by the destruction of Mustafa. The long reign of the second Amurath was troubled to the end, and his vigorous and able enterprises continually checked, by the restlessness and impatience which the defeat of Angora had awakened in the Turcoman chieftains of Asia Minor. The old families to whom Timour had once more opened a chance of independence, were very loth to surrender it again to their powerful yet now frequently divided conquerors. And the Ottomans, though strong enough to chastise and weigh them down, were a long time before they could, by successive efforts, extinguish, as they had done before, their revived power. They were often obliged, for the time, to be forbearing, even in victory. Three times did the restored chiefs of Karaman, the old rivals of the Ottomans, break their engagements, and stir up war. Their inveterate feud made them intrigue with Amurath's Christian enemies—with Manuel of Constantinople, and Sigismund of Hungary. Yet after each victory, Amurath was content with a tribute, or the cession of a city, with allying their princes to his family by marriage, or investing them with distant governments; he never pushed his advantage to extremity, and the rebellious house of Karaman was neither extirpated nor dispossessed. The Ottomans also began to employ against rebels whom it was difficult to attack, the smooth perfidy which their successors learnt so well to use. Thus was cut off the wily and able Djouneid, one of the most turbulent and dangerous chiefs of the Ionian coast, who had been the life of every civil war since Bajazet's defeat, and who had successively betrayed every pretender, whose cause he had directed and strengthened. Iurkedsch-Pasha set the precedent of that peculiar fashion of ensnaring an enemy, which is so familiar to all readers of Ottoman history. Four Turcoman brothers were the chiefs of a band of freebooters who infested Iurkedsch's government of Amasia. He sent to offer them, in the Sultan's name, a territory of their own, if they would give their assistance against another tribe. The offer was accepted, the treaty concluded, the chiefs complimented and honoured with presents, and the whole band, 400 men, enticed to partake of the Pasha's hospitality at Amasia. In the drunkenness and carelessness of a sumptuous banquet, they were overpowered and seized. They were thrown into a cavern in the rock of the citadel, the entrance was walled up, and all were stifled with smoke. The doer of this deed was the *Lala*, the tutor of Amurath, and after him, of his sons; and

the deed itself is recorded to his honour by the historian, who relates nothing but the worthy actions of his master's house. In this there is nothing to wonder at: the banquet was, from the times in which Idris wrote, the usual scene of the Ottoman's craftiest and deadliest revenge.<sup>1</sup>

Yet Amurath accomplished what his father had begun. At the end of his long reign, the Ottoman power, which was yet in danger at its commencement, was once more all that it had been, in greatness and security, on the eve of Angora. His reign began by Manuel of Constantinople dictating conditions of friendship, and setting up a creature of his own to invade Amurath's birthright. It ended by Amurath's choosing a vassal Cæsar among Manuel's children, and imposing the last emperor on the throne of Constantine.

The old preponderance of the Ottomans in all the countries between the Carpathians and the three seas, gradually rose clearer and more irresistible. Their frontier began to advance again, no more to recede for centuries. Beyond their frontier, the adjoining Christian states paid them tribute, and served them in their wars; and their armies began to appear with terrible power in those which still bade them defiance, and had hitherto been beyond their reach. Their western post on the Danube was pushed from Widdin to Semendra; and when they were obliged to retire from before Belgrade, Amurath said he could afford to wait, for Belgrade must be theirs sooner or later. Janina the southern, and Croia the northern capital of Albania, became Turkish cities. Janina offered its keys on condition of retaining its franchises; and in the demolition of its churches and the forced marriages of its daughters, experienced what Turkish faith was worth. The Lord of Croia, John Castriota, died when his four sons were hostages at Amurath's Porte; and Amurath, when he seized their heritage, compelled them to embrace his faith, and serve it with their swords. But the outrage and the perfidy raised up its avenger; and one of these forced converts has left his name to history, as the wildest and fiercest foe the Ottomans ever encountered, the implacable and unconquered Scanderbeg. Later in his reign, Amurath wrested the Morea from the stoutest of the Palæologi, and restored it only, swept of 60,000 slaves, as a tributary fief of the Porte. Within the limits of the old Greek Empire, he fiercely warned off every intruder, even when he had not actually taken possession. John Palæologus, or the inhabitants themselves, had sold Thessalonica to the Venetians. Amurath claimed it of the Republic. It had been conquered by his grandfather Bajazet; it was part of the inheritance of his house;

---

<sup>1</sup> Von Hammer, i. 330. Idris died 1523.

'its possession by the Greeks and their Cæsars he might have overlooked—they were the natural tenants of the land, and its first masters—but no Latin would he allow to intercept his claim. 'The Venetians must go back to their own land: otherwise he would be there himself.' The embassies of the Republic were sent in vain; 'Have you authority to restore me my Salonik?'<sup>1</sup> was his first and only question. The Venetians kept their ground for a few years; but at length Amurath appeared with overpowering numbers before its walls. The Italian defenders were few; the Greek inhabitants disaffected; an earthquake spread discouragement and alarm. Amurath, while his arrows swept the ramparts and his miners dug beneath them, was liberal in his promises of pardon and protection; but when the Venetians still held out, he gave the spoil and the people of Thessalonica to his army, and only reserved to himself the ground on which it stood, and the bare walls of its buildings. Thessalonica was stormed and depopulated; the last of the many terrible calamities which had fallen on that great city—one, like Thebes, of the unlucky cities of history;<sup>2</sup> the first great siege in which the Ottomans, soon to become famous in this trying operation of war, assailed with success obstinately defended walls, and proved the fury and power of their storming columns.

The first great siege in which they had succeeded,—but not the first which they had attempted. Amurath had, early in his reign, replied to the slippery and ill-judged policy of Manuel, and to his insincere excuses when it failed, by saying that he would bring an answer in person to the gates of Constantinople. He came, through ravaged fields and wasted villages, where his soldiers had torn up the very roots of the vines and fruit-trees, and invested the land front of the city, from the sea to the head of the Golden Horn. The attack was the prelude and rehearsal of the great siege, thirty-one years later: the points assailed were the same; the siege-works and engines of the Ottomans were on a greater scale than any yet recorded in their history. They raised a continuous mound with fire-proof towers, facing, at a bow-shot's distance, and commanding with its missiles, the rampart of the city; they had all the ancient machinery of a siege; but they had not yet the new artillery of Mahomet the Conqueror. Amurath had promised Constantinople and its treasures to the conquering Moslems. Besides the soldiers of his host, there were collected round the Christian capital a rabble from all parts, lusting for plunder and blood,—armed ruffians to secure, and monied ruffians to purchase, the spoil,—such a crew as always collects in the East, when a rich and populous city is

---

<sup>1</sup> Daru, xiii. No. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Von Hammer, i. 336.



about to fall.<sup>1</sup> But foremost in ferocity and the madness of savage expectation and fanatic passion,—crying, howling, whirling, raging like wild beasts,—was an unclean rout of five hundred dervishes, who claimed the convents as their share of the prey, and kept at its height the excitement of the army. Their leader was the great Scheikh, Mahomet of Bochara, the Emir-Sultan, ‘the chief among the princes’ of Moslem holiness, the brother-in-law of Bajazet; who had girded Amurath with Othman’s sword, and who had once before, it was believed, helped the true heir of Othman by his prayers. At the river of Ulubad, when Amurath and his rival Mustafa stood with their armies on the opposite banks, and the fortune of the empire hung in doubt between them, the great Sheikh of Bochara had prayed three days continuously for Amurath: at the end of the three days, the loud voice of Michalogli stirred their old allegiance in the hearts of Mustafa’s *Akindjis*, and the rest of the usurper’s host melted away from him. Now, the great Scheikh rode into the Ottoman camp amid a crowd of dervishes, who prostrated themselves before him, and kissed his hands, his feet, and the bridle of his mule. He shut himself up in his tent, to ascertain the fortunate day and hour when Constantinople was to fall. When he came forth, he announced that on Monday, the 24th August, one hour after midday, he would lead the Ottomans into their destined capital. A dervish with a wooden sabre had preceded the early Ottomans in their attacks on the Bithynian cities; so now, at the appointed moment, the great Scheikh mounted his horse at the head of the army; a huge buckler was borne before him; and surrounded by the crowd of yelling and frantic dervishes, he drew his scymitar and shouted forth the signal for assault. But Constantinople resisted stoutly and successfully. Manuel, the emperor, lay dying in his palace; but his son, John Palæologus, was at the post of danger—the fated gate of S. Romanus. This time, the Cæsar did not stand there in vain. Women armed themselves with reaping-hooks for swords, and the ends of barrels for bucklers; monks and priests were mingled with the fighting men, and shouted the sacred names of the Gospel in answer to the war-cry of the dervishes. The fury of the assailants broke in vain against the ramparts; it raged till the setting of the sun; then, says the Greek historian of the siege, it suddenly passed into a panic terror; the Holy Virgin had appeared on the battlements, in awful majesty, to the very eyes of the great Scheikh himself; and the whole Turkish host burned their engines and broke up from Constantinople. The Turkish power had not yet regained

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gordon and Tricupi, on the siege of Tripolitza by the Greeks in 1821.

its strength, for the great effort: an outburst of civil war, and the appearance of a new pretender at Nicæa, recalled Amurath from his premature enterprise; and he never after attempted to renew it.

And indeed till the very end of Amurath's long and fortunate reign, that power, though mounting year by year to its old supremacy, was not safe from trials which jeopardized its existence. The last and decisive one,—the issue of which might have overthrown the Ottomans more hopelessly than they were overthrown at Angora, but which did in fact give the empire of the East finally into their hands,—was their great conflict with Hungary. During the earlier part of Amurath's reign, a desultory but bloody strife had raged on the border, in Transylvania and the Bannat: success had alternated, but Sigismund was an unlucky leader, and the wounds which the Turks inflicted were the deepest. Hungary was beginning to feel their system of preliminary ravage, by which each country, as they drew near its limits, was prepared for the condition of a tributary province, till they were able to occupy and parcel it out among themselves, into *sanjaks* and *timars*, the military fiefs by which the empire was maintained and carried forward. The cry of terror, 'The wolves, the wolves!' continually gave notice to the Hungarian villages that the dreaded turbans had been descried in their neighbourhood; and Hungarian boys and maidens, swept from under the walls of Kronstadt and Hermanstadt, were driven in such troops through the passes of the Carpathians, that a slave was bartered against a pair of boots in the Ottoman camp.<sup>1</sup> There were intervals of truce. The sessions and intrigues of the council of Basle were relieved, by the appearance of the envoys and magnificent presents of the Emperor of the Turks to the Emperor of the Romans: the embassy came to congratulate Sigismund on his election to the empire, and to offer a lasting peace; it was received by him with solemn pomp and honour in the cathedral, and the presents and the peace accepted. Yet Sigismund was at the same time corresponding with the Karamanian disturbers of the Ottoman power in Asia; and Amurath's pashas were soon leading the Christians of Servia and Wallachia, to join in a foray on their brethren of Transylvania. But towards the end of

<sup>1</sup> The historian Aschik-pachasade thus relates his own experience:—'Cette année (1438) le Sultan Mourad dévasta l'Hongrie. Le butin fut immense. Moi-même, le pauvre, j'achetai pour 100 aspres un beau garçon, car moi, le pauvre, je fis partie de l'armée. Un jour, je me présentai chez le Sultan, et il me fit don de plusieurs prisonniers; alors je lui dis: Seigneur et Sultan, il faudrait avoir des chevaux et de l'argent pour emmener ces prisonniers. Sur le champ il me fit donner deux chevaux et 5,000 aspres. J'arrivai donc à Adrinople avec quatre chevaux et neuf prisonniers. Je vendis ceux-ci pour 300 et 200 aspres la tête.'—Von Hammer; (trad. de Hellert,) notes: il. 492.

Amurath's life, the raids and inroads on the Hungarian border gradually swelled into a serious and formidable war, which for once threatened the Turkish power with the combined and determined hostility of Christendom. John Hunyady, who is said to have owed his existence to a furtive amour of King Sigismund with a fair Hungarian lady, when he was seeking refuge from Bajazet's horsemen,<sup>1</sup>—a chief who in the irregular warfare of his country had no equal, except his contemporary Scanderbeg, fiery, audacious, crafty, and pitiless as the Ottomans whom he fought, and as open as they to corrupt and selfish influences, had made his name, in two or three years, a word of fear to those, before whom Europe trembled. The terrible and bloody '*Yanko*,' as the Turks called him, had slain one of Amurath's veteran chiefs, and captured a second; his soldiers had slaughtered his captives before him while he sat at meat, and he had sent to Buda a chariot, heaped with the choicest spoils, and surmounted with the heads of the fallen pashas. The warlike chiefs of Servia and Wallachia, who had so often fought for Amurath, went over to the winning Christian side; and a legate from Rome appeared in Hungary to fan the rising enthusiasm, and urge on the fierce valour of Hunyady. The rival councils of Basle and Florence, exhausted but not reconciled, had just ended their weary and fruitless sessions; and the crafty Venetian patrician, who sat in S. Peter's chair at Rome, seized the moment to turn men's thoughts from the thorny questions of internal reformation to a war with the Turks. Giuliano Cesarini, the cardinal who had so ably led the pertinacious and disrespectful fathers of Basle in their struggle with the Pope, and had already shown his zeal, if not his aptitude, in the conduct of a religious war against the Bohemian heretics, was despatched to employ his eloquence, his subtlety, and his turbulence, in rousing the wild nations of the Danube and the Vistula, in the name of the Holy Father. He succeeded. A little while before, Amurath could interfere in the internal affairs of Poland, and prescribe the conditions on which he was willing to support young Ladislaus on its throne. Now Ladislaus, king at once of Poland and Hungary, was the head of a confederacy, which included all the neighbouring Christian nations, Hungary, Poland, Servia, Wallachia, together with the Pope, the great maritime powers, Genoa, Venice, and Philip of Burgundy, and lastly, the Cæsar of Constantinople. A fleet of Italian and Flemish galleys, with the Pope's nephew, the Cardinal of Venice, as their admiral—such a post might not be wholly unsuitable to one who, though a churchman, was a Venetian nobleman—assembled at the Helles-

<sup>1</sup> Engol, in Von Hammer, i. 188. It is not the common account.

pont. John Hunyady, followed by the king and Cardinal Julian, burst like a tempest across the Danube. He beat the Turks out of Servia. He swept them before him, along that famous north-western road, the old pathway of armies on their march to decide the fate of nations; but which, for many years, had only seen them moving with unbroken uniformity against the west, and never in the reverse direction. Amurath stood under the walls of Nissa, only to be utterly overthrown. The Turks were pushed back to the mountain ramparts of the Balkan; half the great road to Constantinople, with its stations, was in the hands of the Christian army, and winter found them preparing to scale, amid snow and storm, the guarded defiles of the Balkan. Hunyady first tried the pass of Trajan's Gate, through which the direct road is carried; but he found it barricaded with rocks and paved with ice: he tried the next one to the east, the pass of Isladi, and on Christmas-eve, amid rolling rocks and descending avalanches, fought his way to the southern crests of Hæmus, and opened the road through Trajan's Gate to the army of Ladislaus. Once more the Turks were routed beyond the Balkan; and Hunyady, after slaughtering a hundred and seventy of his prisoners, led back a brother-in-law of Amurath, and the Beglerbeg, or military chief of Roumelia, to grace his triumph at Buda.

For the first time in their history, a sultan of the Ottomans sued for peace. It was not the time for peace: for Albania was rising against him under Scanderbeg; the Christian fleet was in the Hellespont; the Karamanian Turks were in league with the Christian powers, which had driven him across the Balkan; and while he was losing Europe, he was threatened in Asia. It was not the time for peace: but Ladislaus waited long for promised succours to renew the war, and they did not come; George Brankovich, lord of Servia, wanted to get his children out of the hands of Amurath, and to bargain with him for the future remission of all tribute and vassalage; it is alleged, that 50,000 Turkish ducats won the influence of the great Hunyady to the side of peace.<sup>1</sup> In spite of the earnest efforts of Cardinal Julian, peace was granted. The spring of 1444 was wasted, and in the summer, a truce of ten years, by which Amurath surrendered the tributes of Servia and Wallachia, but retained possession of Bulgaria, was solemnly agreed to. Copies of the treaty were made in both languages. Amurath swore to it on the Koran, and the Turks demanded that King Ladislaus should swear on the Sacred Host. This was refused; but he gave his oath to observe it on the Gospels.

---

<sup>1</sup> Contin.<sup>de</sup> Fleury, an. 1444. No. 2.

Such was the fruit of Hunyady's boasted 'Long Campaign.' Such was the use, which the Christian potentates of the Danube made, of the first great success they had ever won against the Ottomans. One of them got back his children; a couple of provinces were spared their tributes, till their mighty and inflexible enemy had gathered up his strength, in the breathing time which their princes had pledged to him; and for this ignoble and miserable bargain, the only moment when they had him at advantage was thrown away, the claims were neglected of their allies, who had gone with them into the war but were not included in the peace, and the hopes and the future of their brethren and their children, and of that Christian faith for which they had so pompously taken up arms, finally sacrificed. Well might Cardinal Julian indignantly protest against their selfish and short-sighted folly. Well might remonstrances from the Bosphorus and the Hellespont denounce their breach of faith with their confederates, and warn them of their madness, in dreaming that a treaty would keep back the Turks. A great opportunity—the greatest chance which the Christians had yet had against them—was lost. It would have been well, if this had been all; if the gross mistake of levity and greediness had not been followed by a great and memorable crime, deliberately committed under the auspices of the most venerable authority in Christendom.

Cardinal Julian had spoken like a statesman, wisely and manfully, *before* the oath by which King Ladislaus had confirmed the treaty. He spoke like a swindler and a knave *after* it. The word of a king, and the oath of a Christian, sworn, if not on the Holy Sacrament, at least on the Holy Gospels, were in his view no difficulties in attempting to undo what he had failed to prevent. It is likely enough that the light and wayward chiefs around him soon repented of their bargain. It is certain that the representative of the apostolic throne left no means untried to make them do so. But to their instincts, rude and fierce as they were, the oath was a barrier. Then did their chief spiritual guide, speaking in the name of the Great Pastor of Christians, and by the authority of Christ, undertake to allay their scruples. To these untaught barbarian children of rapine and war, the subtle and practised lawyer of Padua, who had come bringing them wisdom and benedictions from Rome, unfolded and explained the favourite thesis of that age of audacious hypocrisy and perfidy, that an oath is not binding, when high considerations of public good, and especially of the good of religion, are interfered with by its observance: and when the plausible diplomatist had confounded their sense of right and wrong, the Apostolic Legate, by the command and the divine powers of his

master, pronounced the oath invalid, and absolved all from its obligation. On the 15th of July, Ladislaus swore peace on the Gospels to Amurath. On the 4th of August, Cardinal Julian, the Legate of the Pope, made the king and his council swear again, in the name of the most Holy Trinity, of the most Glorious Virgin Mary, of S. Stephen and S. Ladislaus, that he would break his treaty with the Ottomans, and appear with an army before Orsova, on the 1st of September.<sup>1</sup> After such a deed, by such actors, it is hardly worth noticing, that some of them contrived that corruption and deceit should be added to perjury; but it is recorded that Hunyady, who is said to have been bought for the treaty by Amurath's gold, was bought for its violation by the promise of the kingdom of Bulgaria; and that, at his instance, the public declaration of war was delayed till the 1st of September, in order that the Ottomans might have restored the fortresses which they were to give up by the treaty, before they had warning that it was at an end.

Amurath had chosen that very moment for the first of his two abdications: whatever his reason, the step itself argued as much reliance on the oath of Ladislaus, as confidence in the general strength of the Ottoman state. But he at once re-assumed the government, and hurried back to Europe, when he heard that the Hungarians were assailing the fortresses of Bulgaria, on the Danube and the sea. How he crossed from Asia, is yet a question. The Hellespont was held by the Western galleys; the Bosphorus, it might be supposed, was commanded by the navy of the Golden Horn; and for neither were the war-ships of the Turks at that time a match. It is reported by one of the Hungarian historians, that ships of Genoa ferried the Turkish soldiers across the Bosphorus, and that the fare was a ducat a-head. However this was, Amurath crossed the Balkan, and with greatly superior numbers met the Christian host, encamped before Varna, with their left flank resting on the marshy lake of Devno, on ground which has since been made but too famous, by the losses of a Russian army in an obstinate siege, and of an English one in the idleness of a pestilential summer. On S. Martin's-eve, 1444, was fought this

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the transaction which is thus described in an eloquent review of the fortunes and probable destiny of the Turks: 'They, the allied Christian army, had considerable success against him (Amurath) at first; in vain was the bravery of Hunniades, and the preaching of S. John Capistran: the Turk *managed* to negotiate with them, to put them in the wrong, to charge them with perjury; then to beat them in the fatal field of Varna,' &c.—Lectures on the History of the Turks in their relation to Christianity. By the author of *Loss and Gain*. P. 180. This is a singular way of putting the facts. The Turk has much to answer for in the matter of perfidy; yet it seems rather hard, that he should also be made responsible for the treacherous counsels of a Roman Cardinal, and the deliberate jury of a Christian king, *against himself*.



great wager of battle. On high, between the two armies, and between earth and heaven, was exposed on a spear-point the treaty which Ladislaus had signed and sworn to: and in terrible words—words recorded by Christians and Ottomans—Amurath called on Him by whom it was sworn, to prove his truth by punishing the guilty. The wild and confused battle of the cavalry, the main arm on both sides, and the only one employed by the Christians, seemed at first to go heavily against the Ottomans. Even Amurath's courage and hope gave way; he was turning his horse out of the throng, when one of his pashas, more trustful than himself, seized his bridle and forced him to remain; but so near were the Hungarian sabres to his person, that one of them struck down an officer of the Janissaries, who attempted to release the Sultan's bridle from the hand of his daring subject. The horsemen of Hunyady and of Wallachia had borne down and swept before them, on the right wing and the left, the spahis of Thrace and of Anatolia; but the burning core of battle, was, as always, where amid the whirl and reflux of charging and rallying squadrons, the infantry of the Janissaries fought and stirred not. The Janissaries stood firm behind their ditch and palisades, and till they were broken, the field was not lost. Ladislaus dashed against them with the fiery youth of Hungary, and perished beneath their spears. He fell wounded: they refused him quarter: his head was raised aloft on a pike, and Hunyady fought in vain to wrest from them this signal of the Ottoman victory. That ghastly sight spoke to both armies in clear and dreadful emphasis the verdict of the day. The Wallachs and Servians fled and dispersed; and in the evening Hunyady himself escaped, and left the Hungarians to defend themselves as they could, behind the baggage waggons. Next day the camp was stormed, and they were massacred. Two bishops of Hungary fell, among the magnates and chiefs who perished with King Ladislaus;<sup>1</sup> and with them, perished the lying prophet, who had absolved them from their oath, Cardinal Julian.

The miserable fall, in the flower and pride of youth, of a king of Poland and Hungary; the death in battle of a cardinal and a legate of Rome, who had played such a leading part in the history of his day; and the swift and sudden stroke of retribution on violated faith, inflicted before the eyes of both Christian and Mahometan worlds, have made the field of Varna memorable,

<sup>1</sup> We are reminded of these days by the following extract from a newspaper of the day:—"A consistory was held at the Vatican on the 16th ult. for the purpose of conferring the scarlet hat on Cardinal Scitowski, Primate of Hungary. The Primate has greatly scandalised the pacific clergy of Rome by persisting in wearing a splendid dagger at his waist, "*ad defendendam crucem*," as he piously observes, his gold cross hanging immediately above the weapon."

above more decisive battles. Varna, terrible as was its lesson, had not broken the Hungarian power, nor quelled the spirit of Hunyady. Which nation was to be mistress on the Danube, had still to be determined. It was determined four years after. In the summer of 1448, Hunyady led forth a numerous army, the finest and best equipped that Hungary had yet raised, with auxiliaries from Wallachia, and a band of German and Bohemian musqueteers, across the great river, and up the valley of the Morava. Serbia was then leagued with the Moslems, and ravaged by the Christians. In the autumn, Amurath and Hunyady met again; their meeting was where Turks and Christians had met once before, under another Amurath, and a king of Serbia, —the mountain plain of Kossova, the famous 'Ousel's field.' At Kossova, the natural trysting-place and battle-lists for the nations between the Adriatic and the Euxine, Scanderbeg, from Albania, was to have joined with Hunyady. But he did not come; the year was wearing on, and Hunyady attacked without him. On S. Luke's-eve, (17th Oct.) began a three days' battle; a harder one than even that, which, sixty years before, had made the highland brook, that wanders through the 'Ousel's field,' run red with Ottoman and Slavonian blood. The cavalry skirmishes of the first day, the fierce and earnest conflicts of the second, between Hunyady's skilfully divided and successively relieved squadrons, and Amurath's huge and storming masses, left the victory still to win: the German musqueteers bravely kept the centre and key of the Christian line; the Janissaries, entrenched and immovable, were again the sure rallying-point of the Turks. A night-attack failed against their composed and steady courage. The morrow of S. Luke found the battle still raging which had begun on the eve, but found discouragement in the Christian ranks. By the evening, Amurath had won his last and greatest victory. Once more Christian warriors had sold their brethren; once more the first of Christian captains had deserted his soldiers in the hour of disaster, and left them behind him, to find their own way from the field, or be slaughtered on it. The Wallachians had been bought, and had gone over to Amurath. Hunyady, at the last, led his Germans and his artillery to stop the Janissaries; and, sheltered by the engagement, escaped, and escaped with difficulty, through hostile Serbia. The second Kossova decided between the Ottomans and the Hungarians,—as the first had done between the Ottomans and the Slavonians,—who were to advance, and who to yield. Hunyady's valour was henceforth reserved for the defence of his country. Scanderbeg, who, if he had been waited for, might have turned the scale at Kossova, continued to maintain his freedom fiercely among the

Illyrian precipices, and on his mountain eyrie of Croia;<sup>1</sup> but now the last struggle had been made, and henceforth the cause of Christendom was irretrievable, to the south of the Danube.

And the man who had carried through to its triumphant close this fateful conflict; who had won back for his house and race all that they had lost in Timour's victory; who had coped successfully with greater difficulties within, and more dangerous foes without, than his great conquering namesake, had, at forty years of age, become weary of his power, and longed for repose. A devotee in the view of Gibbon, a voluptuary in that of Von Hammer,—in reality, perhaps, both (for a life of easy and luxurious indulgence has often been no illegitimate accompaniment of Moslem devotion,) Amurath twice, with eager and hasty pertinacity, seized the occasion of apparent peace, to relinquish the throne of Othman and Bajazet to a son of only fourteen years. The first time was when the oath of the King of Hungary seemed to secure a ten years' truce with the only Christians whom he feared. He returned to conquer and to avenge. Then, from the bloody field of Varna, and the imperial state of Adrianople, he hastened away, the second time, to the unclouded Ionian skies, and the cypress groves and tulip gardens of Magnesia. With them, he reserved to himself the revenues of Ionia and Caria. Of his favourite pleasance, the fragment of a wall, and a few straggling cypresses, still remain. Near them—with the mosques and baths, the mad-house and the almonry, the school and the caravanserai, which are the motley monuments of another Amurath's luxury and devotion at Magnesia—is a mausoleum with more than twenty tombs—tombs of the youths and dames, it is said, who shared the retirement of the two sultans. But whether that of the conqueror of Varna was ascetic or voluptuous; whether he danced and howled with dervishes, or gave himself up to a soft and Epicurean ease, the Ottoman state soon needed again his experienced and vigorous hand. The first recorded mutiny of the Janissaries followed his abdication; the viziers of his son appeased it, and taught the soldiers their strength, by an increase of pay; and then earnestly intreated Amurath to return once more. A second time, within a year, he came back to the power, which he found that he could not abandon; and distaste or weariness did not abate the vigour and spirit with which he resumed the ambition and the policy of his race. His last years were at once his most glorious ones, and his most chequered. He overran the Morea: he conquered at Kossova: he gave its last Greek emperor to Con-

<sup>1</sup> See a sketch of Croia, in Lear's 'Albania,' p. 116.

stantinople. But he, who had broken the might of kingdoms, was baffled and humbled, to the very day of his death, in a petty and protracted mountain war. He made no more obstinate efforts anywhere, than he did to break or soften the spirit of Scanderbeg; he had never known such reverses, as dogged his armies through the stern passes of Albania, and before the crags on which were perched its robber fastnesses. The last scene of a long and fortunate reign was his repulse, sick and heart-broken, from before the walls of Croia, into which his gold could not buy an entrance, and which the huge stone bullets, launched for the first time from Turkish cannons, could not shatter; and the envied and dreaded Amurath went back to die by a fit of apoplexy, at a banquet at Adrianople.

With him ended the first series of the Ottoman kings; of those remarkable and persevering chiefs, who laid the foundations, and drew the plan, and prepared the power, of the Ottoman state. A little more than two years after Amurath's death, his son, a conqueror at twenty-three, rode through the broken wall to take possession of S. Sophia; so ready was everything left to his hand; so successfully had his father and grandfather laboured to repair the ruins and efface the stain of Angora. With Mahomet the Conqueror, a change comes over the character of the Ottoman state and its rulers. The possession of the centre of Eastern civilization, instead of softening and taming them, corrupted and debased them. They retained and exaggerated the vices of their fathers: they lost, what appear at least at this distance of time, their nobler and more hopeful qualities. For, fierce and remorseless conquerors as they were, men of passion and men of blood, the earlier sultans yet exhibit a far higher stamp, both of intellect and of character, than is to be found, with perhaps one exception, in the long line which followed the Conqueror. They planned, they ruled, they fought in person, and not by the mind and hand of slaves. There appears in them a power of self-control and self-constraint, of patience and forbearance, which disappeared when their children found themselves in the palace of the Cæsars; and merciless as their wars were, we do not read, except in the instance of the massacre of Nicopolis, of those monstrous and wanton slaughters of helpless crowds, which marked the victories of Timour, and even the *civil* administration of the Ottomans of Constantinople. When Amurath II. gave Thessalonica to the spoiler, he forbade and prevented massacre.<sup>1</sup> Two points may be particularly observed, in which the earlier are strikingly contrasted with the later sultans.

---

<sup>1</sup> Von Hammer, i. 351.

One is, the praise that is given to most of them, for justice and consideration to their Greek subjects, by the Greek historians who wrote at the very time when they were destroying the Greek empire. When all abatements that may be necessary are made, these reports yet show a feeling on the subject, which assuredly could seldom be found in later times. We are told of the strict impartiality of Othman's tribunal at Kara Hissar. We are told that under Orchan, the Greeks of Nicæa and Brusa preferred submitting to his rule, than passing over, as they might have done, to the dominions of the Christian Cæsar. Chalcocondylas compares the justice of the first Amurath to that of Cyrus, though the historian had suffered bitterly at his hands.<sup>1</sup> The united testimony of Ottomans and Byzantines bears witness to the humanity, the uprightness, the truthfulness and good faith, the gentleness, both to Greeks and Turks, of the first Mahomet. Ducas and Chalcocondylas both speak of the nobleness, justice, and equity, of the redoubtable conqueror of Varna;<sup>2</sup> and perhaps he was the last of the sultans whose word was generally given in sincerity, and could be trusted without imprudence. The other point is, their relations to their own ministers and servants. Every one who has looked into later Ottoman history, has been tormented by the confounding rapidity, with which the names of the great men of the state are changed, or rather, what adds to the perplexity, with which the changes are rung on a very confined list of names. With a very few exceptions, no grand vizier, no general or admiral, stays long enough on the scene for the reader to fix and master a distinct image of the man. In each case a slave has toiled up from the meanest condition, and often by the basest services: he appears, for a moment, on the pinnacle of power—for a moment, the absolute disposer of life and of welfare, in the mightiest despotism of the world: his master's hand waves, and the head rolls; or the slave drops, without a murmur or a memorial, into the nameless herd from which he rose. But the names are few, and recur continually and for long spaces of time, of those who helped and served the early sultans. Their prolonged and unbroken service speaks of honour and attachment on the part of the master, as much as of loyalty in the dependant. They were vassals and liegemen, not slaves. We do not find a single instance of capricious and sanguinary outbursts of displeasure against a great servant of the state, till the cruel and vindictive Mahomet the Conqueror. We hardly find till his day an instance of even a change or a disgrace. Great families grew up, and took root in the con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Von Hammer, i. 180.<sup>2</sup> Idem, i. 351.

quered provinces, from whom the chiefs of the army were taken, like the children of Evrenos in Macedonia, or Timurtash in Anatolia. There was even a strong tendency to hereditary office,—in some cases, apparently, even by special privilege. Out of the first six viziers of the empire, one family, Black Halil's children, the Dchendereli, furnished four. The difference is perhaps made most palpable when we look at the lists, in Von Hammer's book, of the grand viziers and other great officers of the empire. In four centuries and a half, he enumerates 162 grand viziers; of these, the first six occupy more than the first of the centuries. The first six viziers served five sultans, till the reign of Mahomet the Conqueror. In the third year of his reign, the year of the taking of Constantinople, he put to death the vizier his father had left him, the namesake and descendant of Black Halil. In the thirty years of his reign, six grand viziers were deposed,—exactly as many as had served his five predecessors during a space of a hundred and thirty years. The seventh was slain by the Janissaries. And the changes were at least equally rapid under all the succeeding sultans.

Three times did Mahomet the Conqueror ascend the Ottoman throne. Twice he had resigned it, a sullen and reluctant boy of fourteen, whom it was necessary to inveigle out of the way, lest he should resist his father to his face, when, to save the state, he appeared to resume his abdicated power. The third time, seven years older, he sprang on the great prize with the eagerness and ferocity of a beast of prey. He never drew bridle from Magnesia, when he heard of his father's death, till on the second day he reached Gallipoli, on his way to Adrianople. To smother his infant brother in the bath was his first act of power; and then he turned, with all the force of his relentless and insatiate nature, to where the inheritor of what remained of the greatness of the Cæsars,—leisurely arranging marriages and embassies,—still detained from the Moslems the first city of the East;—little knowing the savage eye that was fixed upon him, little suspecting the nearness of a doom, which had so often threatened and had been so often averted.

For a hundred and fifty years the Ottomans had marked Constantinople for their own, and had waited. Long had been the waiting. Rapidly, and in hot and urgent haste, did the end arrive at last. All was at first peace and amity between the Ottoman and the Greek. The Greek even presumed to be the first to menace: the grand vizier, the friend of the Greeks, warned them of their madness in rousing the tiger before the time; but the words of Mahomet were still grave and courteous. The first year of his reign was almost over, and yet no signs were apparent to the Greeks of the fate which was drawing



near. But in the winter, the tidings came to Constantine, that the Ottomans purposed to build a castle on the European shore of the Bosphorus, at its narrowest interval, and corresponding to one already built in Asia: that the site had been chosen at five miles distance from Constantinople, and the materials collected. Constantine remonstrated, but vainly. 'No,' said the Ottoman, 'he meant nothing against Constantinople;—but he should build on his own ground, for his own purposes; and the next messenger who dared to interfere should be flayed alive!' The announcement and the message revealed to Constantine the greatness of the crisis; but not to his people. He would have drawn the sword, but they refused. 'Amid hope and fear, the fears of the wise and the hopes of the credulous, the winter rolled away,' while Mahomet was burning his lime, and felling his timber, and quarrying his stone, to be ready for the first days of spring. Spring came, and with it his busy masons and zealous officers; and the summer saw the Bosphorus commanded by a new Turkish castle, bearing, in its fantastic outline,<sup>1</sup> an augury and a memorial of the man and the faith, which were henceforth to reign along those shores. Still Mahomet spoke not of conquest: but he pulled down churches to build his towers, and his soldiers turned their horses into the corn-fields under the walls of Constantinople, and slaughtered the peasants when they resisted. And he himself was eagerly and curiously questioning the cunning Hungarian engineer, whom the niggardness of the Greek arsenal had driven over to the Ottomans, about the powers of his art; and whether he could cast a cannon whose stroke should shatter the walls of Constantinople. 'Of Constantinople or of Babylon!' answered the craftsman. His cannon was cast; a Venetian galley, whose topsail was not lowered to Mahomet's castle, was sunk to try its range, and the survivors from the wreck impaled and beheaded, as an earnest of the purposes for which the cannon was destined, and the mind of its employer towards the Christians. Winter came on again,—the second winter. The foundry of the Hungarian engineer was kept in full work. The hugest cannon that had yet been imagined or cast, issued from his moulds, and Adrianople was terrified by its explosion when it was tested. As the time drew on, a fierce and savage impatience took possession of the terrible young man, who was preparing to seize what the greatest of his fathers had vainly longed for. He pried with feverish and dangerous suspicion into the thoughts and wishes of his

<sup>1</sup> The outline of the walls was made to imitate the Arabic letters of the name of *Mohammed*. The three *Me*, a round character in Arabic, were represented by three towers at unequal distances.

soldiers and ministers. 'Give me Constantinople; that is all I require of thee,' was his ejaculation to his grand vizier, whom he had summoned in the restlessness of a sleepless night, to warn him not to be drawn away, as his father and his grandfather had been, by the bribes of the Greeks. So the winter passed with Mahomet, in anxious excitement, but in diligent and careful preparation. In Constantinople it passed, the last winter of the Christian empire, in dull and sluggish expectancy of evil,—deepened by the gloom of dismal prophecies, which were repeated more frequently and more confidently,—disturbed only by furious quarrels of which religion was the watchword,—enlightened by scarcely a gleam of hopefulness, of self-reliance, of purpose. The Emperor, in the maddening extremity of his helplessness, had consented once more to the submission, which the pride of the Popes was content to exact, from those who only gave it in distress, and never with sincerity. The Emperor had consented, but not the people of Constantinople. The Roman union was celebrated in S. Sophia, but cursed in the streets and convents of the city. Christmas, and Lent, and Easter, were spent in the bitterness of party war, in which one side avowed its preference for the Moslem turban over the cardinal's hat. And on the Friday after Easter, the Moslem appeared before the city, to take the boasters at their word, and to still the feuds of the two Churches in a common destruction.

Christendom was cold. The Pope, in spite of the submission of the Emperor, was offended and suspicious. In Constantinople itself, Constantine had made a muster of those who were willing and able to stand by him for their homes and churches. Out of that great city—the number has been preserved—they amounted to four thousand, nine hundred, and seventy-one! Those who defended Constantinople were not its own children, but foreign merchants and foreign adventurers. Out of the twelve posts of consequence around its walls, two only were held by Greeks; the other ten were commanded by Spanish, Italian, and German officers. To the last hour of the Greek empire, it was Christians who betrayed the cause of Christendom. While the flower of that mighty and enthusiastic host, which their determined and remorseless master had gathered round the walls, had been won from Christendom; 'while the greatest part of Mahomet's pashas and Janissaries were the offspring of Christian parents;' Christians, who had their faith and their liberty to save, hung back, and refused to fight in company. The Genoese traders of Galata were bargaining for themselves with Mahomet, in the very height and crisis of the siege; and looked on without molesting him, when

he dragged his barks under their fortifications, from the Bosphorus to the harbour. It was a Christian engineer who gave Mahomet his artillery ;—but he was, perhaps, only a dull craftsman working for his bread ;—it was a Christian ambassador in the camp of Mahomet, the ambassador of the great Hunyady, who instructed the awkward artillerymen how to breach the rampart.

It is some relief in this oppressive spectacle of blindness, of baseness, and of decay, to rest our eyes on the imperfect virtue and desolate end of the last Constantine. A brave man in a herd of cowards, yet even he did not deserve to save Constantinople ; for he had sold his conscience and outraged his people, by purchasing the niggard aid of the Latins at the price of the humiliation of the Eastern Church. But he, at least, had taken his resolution to endure even to death, and that gave him nobleness. He calmly bore the insults of the fanatic and dastardly populace in the streets, who remembered only that he had suffered a Roman legate to profane by the Western ritual the altar of S. Sophia, and hooted him, while he was toiling against hope to save them. Then, when all was done ; when, in spite of all, the Turks were in the harbour, and the walls had crumbled beneath their cannon ; when the great breach was now ready at the gate of S. Romanus, and the last sun had set on an empire of eleven hundred years, he prepared to die, as one who bore the name and the crown of him who had been the first of Christian kings. All Christmas time, all Lent, all Eastertide, at Pentecost, on Ascension-day, there had been emptiness and solitude under the mighty dome of Justinian ; since the Latin prelate had been there, the crowds of Greek worshippers had forsaken it, as delivered over to demons. Its midnight gloom was the fit refuge for a deserted emperor, when his soul came to seek for the last mournful moments of peace. All round the city, from the heights of Galata, along the bridge across the harbour, and in front of the city walls to the shore of the Propontis, a dazzling blaze of illumination lighted up the Turkish lines ; in the camp, and on the sea, festive lamps were hung out on tent, and mast, and yard-arm, and the shouts of exulting multitudes, proclaiming the greatness of the false prophet, and the victory of the morrow, rose fierce and wild on all sides through the night, while the last rite that Christians were to perform in S. Sophia was celebrated, the midnight communion of its doomed emperor. Humbled and meek in his fortitude, he earnestly craved, as his last request, the forgiveness of those from whom he was parting. Dawn found him in the breach, breasting the destroying storm. He bore up while the Genoese captain, Giustiniani, who had fought with

him through the siege, remained by his side. He might, perhaps, have borne up successfully—but Giustiniani was at length wounded; whether from the agony of his wound, or, as others thought, from a despair which he could control no longer, the gallantest of the Italian captains left the breach; and when the stranger forsook him, Constantine sunk beneath his fate. He perished, unrecognised, by an unknown hand. A few hours afterwards, Mahomet rode through the gate, in which the heaps of corpses showed where the last fierce struggle for the perishing empire had taken place; and knew not that the Cæsar's was among them. It was found before evening; and, for the second time within ten years, the head of a Christian king was borne on a pike through the camp of the Ottomans.

The great capital city of the East had fallen, and both Greeks and Latins were alarmed, and mourned its fall. But it had changed owners before, and neither were at once alive to the full significance of *this* change, to the history of the world. Neither suspected, what strong and what cruel masters had come, to take possession of the desolate palaces, where the spider had long stretched her web,<sup>1</sup> and to fill once more, for centuries, their vast and echoing emptiness, with the crowds of a gorgeous court. Mahomet declared himself the protector of the Greeks of Constantinople. The new patriarch, he who had inveighed so fiercely against the Latin union and the compliances of Constantine, received his jewelled crozier from the hand of the infidel, according to the old ceremonial of the Byzantine court; paid him the same homage, received the same honours, as had accompanied the investiture of his predecessors under Christian emperors. But in time, the waste streets of Constantinople became peopled with new inhabitants from distant and strange regions. Where the venerable palace of Bucoleon had stood, the new Seraglio began to crown the promontory of the Golden Horn: the Mosque of the Conqueror rose on the ruins of the Church of the Holy Apostles, and the tombs of the Cæsars; and the Greeks were reminded, that in Constantinople they were in a capital which was not their own. And very soon too, the massacre of their noblest, and the dishonour of their fairest, told them more terribly what a change had come, in the place of the dull and oppressive, yet not sanguinary, Byzantine rule. Then they began to see what was meant by the settlement of the Ottomans at Constantinople; and Europe soon saw it too. The conquering fury of the Ottomans burst forth with new and consuming force, along all its old tracks; Austria and Hungary felt its desolations, renewed

---

<sup>1</sup> See the Persian verses repeated by Mahomet. Gibbon, viii. p. 256.

again and again, though it broke it in vain against the walls of Belgrade; it drove Scanderbeg from the haunts to which he clung so fiercely, to die before he could be conquered; in Europe, Albania, Bosnia, and Peloponnesus—in Asia, Karamania, and the Christian kingdom of Trebizond, sank finally under its strength. But this was not all. Lords of the Bosphorus, the Ottomans from this time, began to claim the seas, as they had subdued the lands. Mahomet was the first builder of an Ottoman fleet, and he lived to see its power. It gave him Negropont and the Archipelago; then it destroyed the settlement of the Genoese at Caffa, and explored the Sea of Azoff, and the mouths of the Don, and the Danube; and from Kilia and Akerman, from the Crimea and Trebizond, the Ottomans were masters of the Black Sea. First of the European states, the Signory of Venice understood the great revolution in the East, and measured its danger. From the time of Mahomet II., no state recognised the importance of the Ottomans so clearly, or had such continual relations with them, both in peace and war, as Venice. Her keen-sighted envoys soon discovered how firmly the Ottoman power was fixed at Constantinople; how, under its remorseless and able chief, it was becoming consolidated and organized into a strong and enduring engine of conquest. Her own fierce wars and chequered negotiations with her new rival at once began, to last till both Venice and the Sultans were exhausted. And she had early and ample confirmation of her forebodings. In a few years, the Ottoman conquests had reached to the shores of her own Adriatic; their fleets had conquered Zante and Cephalonia, had crossed the Ionian Sea and sacked Otranto. And while the entrance of the jealously-guarded Gulf was bordered by a Turkish coast, and threatened by Turkish fleets, the Turkish horsemen had found their way, through Dalmatia and Friuli, across the rivers which pour into it at its head; and before the end of Mahomet's reign, the watch-fires and the burnings of the Ottoman ravagers had been descried from the steeples of the Lagunes.

The chronology of the Ottoman chiefs to Mahomet II. is as follows:—

Othman, 1288—1325.  
Orchan, 1325—1359.  
Amurath I., 1359—1389.  
Bajazet, 1389—1403.  
Mahomet I., 1413—1421.  
Amurath II., 1421—1451.  
Mahomet II., 1451—1481.

Othman, Orchan, and Amurath I. styled themselves *Emirs*. The title of *Sultan* is said to have been first taken by Bajazet; but Mahomet II. still called himself, also, the Great Emir. His style, in the capitulation of Galata, 1453, is—*Ο μέγας Αδελφότης, και μέγας Άμωρᾶς Σουλτάνος ὁ Μεχμέτ Μπέης, κ.τ.λ.* Von Hammer, (Hellert,) ii. 523.

ART. II.—*The many Mansions in the House of the Father, scripturally discussed, and practically considered.* By G. S. FABER, B. D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, &c.; with a *Prefatory Memoir of the Author.* By FRANCIS A. FABER, Rector of Saunderton, Bucks. London: Royston & Brown. 1854.

GEORGE STANLEY FABER belonged, in all his associations and habits, to an age of Anglican divines that is now passing away; and if we cannot wish for the resuscitation of his school, either in literature or theology, we can at any rate afford a sincere tribute to his indefatigable industry, his many amiable qualities, and the extent of his intellectual researches. He was of the class of dignitaries; though not in any unpleasant sense of the word; and, from the very commencement of his career, he was sufficiently in the way of promotion to have been relieved from any acute sense of neglected merit. Would that all his contemporaries, in possession of the Church's lucrative positions, had been equally deserving, and had equally devoted their dignified otium to study, and to the pursuit of truth! To wish they had all been equally voluminous in published writings, intended for the instruction of the public, would be an insincere act of regret, for we do not apprehend that, as a class, the result of their labours would have materially advanced the cause of theology, however useful they might have been to themselves in providing employment suitable to their calling. Mr. Faber, however, was a vast improvement on the worldly money-making dignitaries of his age. There were few of whom it could be said that they used their leisure for the benefit of literature and theology; that they were careful to fulfil such obligations as were connected with the offices they held, and that they made their house and income available for the general benefit of intellectual society.

The work before us was published by its author in 1851, professedly as the result of many years' thought, and in fact, as the expression of certain ideas, with reference to the future life of man, without which he felt in his own case that a Christian's hope would be wanting in tangible and real objects of anticipation. What those views were, we shall subsequently explain; whether or not they meet with any general sympathy on their own merits, it must be at least granted, that speculations on this subject come with peculiar interest from one, almost fourscore years old, whose whole manner of life, even from his



youth, had been calculated to promote serious thoughts of the future, and whose habit of mind had always led him to a very close dependence on the divine Word for his secret convictions. Grossly material, and even grotesque as some of his views may appear to be, they yet merit a degree of respect, as being the legacy of his old age, especially when it is remembered that they did not, by any means, owe their source to that age of life, when they were first published; but were conceived, in the full vigour of his intellectual progress, and were only indebted to the last years of the writer, for their expression in writing and for a confirmed testimony to their truth.

Faber was essentially a controversialist in religion. He felt more at home in this kind of writing than in any other. He was stimulated by the presence of an enemy, and his pen flourished with tenfold energy, when the vision of a hostile theologian was standing before his desk. Yet, withal, he was an amiable warrior, and all sense of honour in his cause was fully satisfied, if blood were drawn from the slightest scratch. He did not in his heart wish to inflict any deep or mortal wound. The pleasure of the combat was in his own adroitness, rather than in the enemies' discomfort; except, towards the latter end of his life, when the mysterious monsters of 'tractarianism' somewhat stirred up that genuine thirst for blood, which strong passions and real home-convictions are at all times liable to encourage. It is a blot on Mr. Faber's literary career that he disfigured it with the intemperate and vulgar vituperations to which we allude. Happily for their writer's reputation, they only survive in the miserable newspaper in which they were first published.

In the earlier part of his life, brought up as he had been with ultra-protestant associations, and possessed also of an instinct for literary combativeness, he as naturally fixed on popery for his object of attack; as in the case of other persons, we find that an unfortunate class of animals, such as foxes, bulls, or badgers, are brought forward into the arena of their combative propensities. As long as Dr. Trevern, Bishop of Strasburg, was his antagonist, he was delightfully in his element. The enemy was respectable, definite, and tangible: he was too distant to provoke any but legitimate personalities, and altogether he was that kind of foe, with whom it is most practicable to fight, and at the same time to feel perfectly cool. Their controversies did, indeed, at length exceed those polite rules of courtesy which Mr. Faber most anxiously studied at their commencement; but it was much after the same manner, and with the same spirit, that distinguish the rival annotations of angry old classic commentators, who were wont to thunder no

measured anathemas at each other, correctly expressed in the Latin tongue.

The following passage conveys what we may almost call a picturesque and somewhat amusing idea of this controversy:—

‘Another kind of compliment was paid to the *Difficulties of Romanism* by the manner in which the Bishop of Strasburg received it. He had been treated with marked and studied courtesy by Mr. Faber; and some of the friends of the latter thought that he had carried the principles of Lord Chesterfield rather further than was desirable. Dr. Trevern’s answer was in a very different strain. Though “a gentleman and a Frenchman,” he forgot the politeness which is said to characterise his nation, and the loss of his temper proved that he was fighting a losing battle. His reply was soon greeted by a rejoinder from Long Newton, and in *this* publication Mr. Faber expressed his sense of the manner in which his courtesy had been received. “We have been wont,” he says, “to esteem the well-polished sword the appropriate weapon of the gentleman; but the Bishop inclines to prefer the obtuseness of a bludgeon, or the deformity of the tomahawk.” Mr. Husenbeth came to Dr. Trevern’s rescue, and an amusing pamphlet from Mr. Faber’s pen was the result of that gentleman’s interference. Subsequently, Mr. H. published a work of some length, entitled “*Faberian exposed and refuted*,” which fell still-born from the press, and was heard of no more.’—*Memoir*, pp. xviii. xix.

Though Mr. Faber had many prejudices, habits, and sentiments, which were characteristic of his contemporaries in our Church, yet on many points he displayed an undoubted originality of thought, as well as most noticeable peculiarities of language, and great freedom from intellectual bondage or the trammels of party. We suspect, indeed, that the work before us,—the publication of which gave him peculiar interest, as one with which he was anxious that his future name should be connected,—was so far antagonistic to the general views of his school in theology, that it was a kind of reaction against what he felt to be a narrow system; a supplement, though eccentric in its character, to fill up what had long appeared a void place in those theological schemes with which he had been associated. The manner in which this was accomplished, the peculiar theories, that is, which he propounded for the satisfaction of his own mind, partook, of course, of his own natural habits of thought, of his love for the positive and tangible, and so far must be received with no little caution; but yet, on the whole, we feel satisfied that, like the majority of errors, they sprang up from a real conviction of some existing defect in the sentiments and views that form the traditions of the day.

Thinking that our readers may take some interest in the very pleasant memoir of this theologian, supplied by his nephew, we propose, in the first place, to be biographical in our notice.

George Stanley Faber was the son of a Yorkshire clergyman, vicar of Calverley, and was born in 1773. His mother, whose

maiden name was Anne Traviss, was descended from Henri de Dibon, exiled on the revocation of the edict of Nantes; a Protestant confessor, from whom all his posterity seemed to have inherited strong religious feelings. A curious heirloom, possessed by the family, helped no doubt to maintain alive the fire of Protestantism, from generation to generation. Henri de Dibon, before he was hurried off by the dragoons of Louis XIV., buried his family Bible within a chest, in his garden. After many sufferings and tortures, such as 'the application of fire to wreaths of straw fastened round his legs'—this torture being resorted to because he was a sufferer from the gout—he at length escaped, and before he quitted his native land for ever, he exhumed the much cared-for treasure, with which he safely arrived in England during the reign of William III. The master of Sherburn, as representative of Henri de Dibon, came into possession of this Bible; and lest its history should be forgotten, or become the subject only of vague oral tradition, he wrote within it a most circumstantial account of its wanderings, together with a genealogy of the Faber family.

At an early age, George Stanley, that member of this family whom we are now considering, was sent to Hipperholme Grammar School, near Halifax, and when only fifteen, was matriculated at University College, Oxford, being elected to a scholarship the following year. The happy days of his undergraduateship were undisturbed by visions of coming strife in the battle-field of University honours; no feelings of ambition or jealousy were prematurely stirred up in the young academical mind, by the invidious and uncourteous practice of numbering men under the figures 1, 2, 3, and 4, in different departments of learning, like the A. I., &c. of metropolitan policemen. If a man was a good companion, and behaved like a gentleman, what more was needed? if he chose to be ignorant, that was his own concern and would be his own loss; for proficiency in scholarship always brought its own reward, and also made a man generally respected in society. How different now! Provided a good class can be obtained at the age of twenty-two, the whole object of literature is accomplished, and the thing too often laid by. On this subject, however, we are not speaking from any comprehensive view of its bearings, we only adduce the particular instance of Mr. Faber from the Memoir before us, as an instance of scholastic proficiency without the list of honours. Are there many candidates for deacon's orders in our days, who, like Mr. Faber, could ask with perfect simplicity of the examining chaplain, whether the answers were to be written in English or Latin? In 1793 he took his degree, and also was elected fellow of Lincoln, where he shortly became a tutor.

After an interval of eight years we find him, in 1801, being then only twenty-eight years of age, University proctor, sitting in judgment, by virtue of that office, on Heber's 'Carmen Seculare,' and also preaching the Bampton Lectures in his 'velvet sleeves.' It did not, however, accord with his tastes to remain in Oxford, or to follow up the academical success he had attained. It was one of his sayings, that 'a fellowship is 'an excellent breakfast, an indifferent dinner, and a most miserable supper.' Acting on this long-conceived sentiment, as well probably as on softer and less philosophical impulses, he took the irremediable step, in 1803, of vacating his fellowship by marrying, having not yet obtained any preferment. His choice is thus pleasantly described by his nephew:—

'The lady he married was Miss Eliza Sophia Scott Waring, second daughter of Major Scott, who took the name of Waring, well known as the friend of Warren Hastings. In this most excellent person he found a "help meet" for him, in the truest sense of the expression. Her own talents and acquirements were very considerable, and whilst she thoroughly appreciated the endowments of her husband, she was well fitted to be the companion of his domestic life. When he became a parish clergyman, the assistance which she gave him was invaluable; for her very active habits made her intimate with the surrounding poor, whilst her benevolent sympathies were ever ready to devise assistance for them. To a numerous acquaintance she was endeared by her social kindness of character; but it was in the "inner circle" that her worth was best understood. Her thoughts were ever engaged on the welfare of others, and it might be safely recorded of her, that in no action of her life did she ever appear to consider herself. Self seemed like a subject totally forgotten by her.

'Words like these but feebly delineate the excellence of the person to whom they are applied, but it may perhaps be permitted to one who knew her well, to pay such an imperfect tribute of gratitude to her memory. "His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani munere."

'It pleased God to grant to this union a long period of duration, and the term of separation betwixt them was brief.'—*Ibid.* pp. xiv. xv.

For two years after his marriage he was content to live in his father's vicarage, acting as curate; at the end of that time Bishop Barrington presented him to the vicarage of Stockton-upon-Tees, in the county of Durham. This was a laborious charge, which necessitated great economy of time, in order to maintain inviolate a certain portion of each day for the seclusion of his study. We are not informed whether he was successful in the parochial art; whether, according to one phraseology, he was a good parish priest, or, according to another, his pulpit ministrations were acceptable to his congregation. His voice was indeed peculiarly mellow, and his reading was much thought of among his friends, but he would not seem to have possessed that rough power of lungs which is most suited to the wants of a populous north country parish. Little, however, is told us of this portion of his experience; probably it was rather

irksome to him, for his removal, in the beginning of 1809, to the rectory of Redmarshall, a rustic village with a small population, is pronounced to have been an acceptable change, as introducing him to a place certainly better adapted to a student like himself, than the larger sphere of action which he quitted. During his incumbency of this place he gave a striking proof, for the age in which he lived, of his honourable freedom from that grasping desire for accumulated Church patronage, which was the disgrace of his time. Bishop Barrington requested Lord Eldon to give him the adjoining benefice of Great Stainton, that he might hold the two livings together; the Chancellor readily consented, and the Bishop wrote to congratulate Mr. Faber on this addition to his income. The offer was, however, graciously declined, at the risk, as his friends thought, of offending his patron. In this, however, they were mistaken, for within a year the Bishop presented him to the rectory of Long Newton, which he held for the long time of twenty-one years, and from whence most of his literary productions emanated. That the act of refusing to be a pluralist was in those days considered a superhuman exercise of self-denial we have the following evidence, from one of much local acquaintance with the clergy:—

‘When this anecdote was first told in the presence of the late Mr. Surtees, of Mainsforth, he rose, and with much gravity announced his intention of ordering his horse instantly. “Why,” said a friend, in astonishment, “where can you be going at this time of night?” “Going!” said he; “why to take a look at a clergyman who has refused to hold two livings, to be sure.” This joke was characteristic enough of the speaker; but Mr. Surtees did not forget the story when he published the History of Durham.’—*Ibid.* p. xvi.

This favourable opinion on the part of Mr Surtees, appears to have been maintained by Mr. Faber’s subsequent reputation, judging from another passage in his history, to which allusion is made in the following extract. The memoirist has premised, quoting Wordsworth’s beautiful lines—

‘Where holy ground begins, unhallow’d ends,  
Is mark’d by no distinguishable sign,’

that at the rectory of Long Newton there was in former times no partition between the churchyard and the shrubbery:—

‘An incumbent, long before Mr. Faber’s time, had built a wall across the lawn; and this he did, as a parish record informs us, because the people of the village were accustomed to inspect the *facta* and listen to the *dicta* of the inmates of the Rectory. “The wall,” Mr. Surtees goes on to say, “is now pulled down, and the cemetery and pleasure ground are again in one; but the *dicta* et *facta* of the present tenant of the manse need not shrink from audience or inspection.”—*Ibid.* p. xvii.

An inspection indeed of Mr. Faber’s proceedings would have entailed great watchfulness, for his daily labours commenced in

his study about six o'clock, and often before; his love of working must almost have amounted to a restless, nervous activity. He was the sole instructor of his two sons, and he was never assisted in his parish by a curate; yet his literary occupations were incessant, for besides his numerous publications, all needing much study, he maintained an extensive correspondence with many distinguished members of the learned world.

Thus tranquilly did Mr. Faber pursue that active and studious life which so well accorded with his tastes, till 1830, when at last he became a dignitary. Bishop Burgess gave him a prebendal stall in Salisbury Cathedral; and in 1832 he received, from Bishop Van Mildert, a still more important piece of preferment, that of Sherburn Hospital; at which place he resided for the remainder of his life. His nephew thus speaks of this change in his fortunes:—

‘To a man of his pursuits and habits nothing could be better adapted; for, by giving him complete command over his own time, it enabled him, without any scruple of conscience, to devote himself as much as he pleased to the labours of the closet. It was, in short, one of those sanctuaries, which the piety of olden times provided as a retreat for the learned and the good; and which the spirit of modern progress, as it is called, would gladly sweep away. To Mr. Faber it was even more than this, for it was given him as a reward for the services of many years. It was his “patent of nobility,” by which he showed to his clerical brethren that he had “approved himself in the office to which he had been called.” There were other circumstances, too, which tended to increase the pleasure of his residence at this place: it is in the immediate neighbourhood of Durham, and amongst the clergy of the Cathedral and the University he had many valued friends. If ever an affirmative answer to the old question, *An locus conveniat locato?* could be given, it might surely have been given here.’—*Ibid.* p. xxxi.

Sherburn Hospital was originally founded, for the exclusive accommodation of lepers, by Bishop Pudsey, in the twelfth century; but in the time of Queen Elizabeth it was devoted to the maintenance of thirty brethren, natives of the Diocese of Durham, only half of whom reside within the walls of the Hospital. The institution also possessed a chaplain, so that no very onerous labours can have fallen on the master. At the present moment the foundation is in abeyance, waiting the ungentle verdict of a ruthless Charity commission. In former times the situation of the Hospital was that of ‘pleasant pastoral seclusion,’ cheered by the bells of Durham Cathedral. Its character, however, is much altered by the substitution of coal-pits for sheep-folds, and of tall, gaunt, slate-coloured men issuing forth from the nether regions of earth, and stumping along on its surface with large wooden clogs, in place of those pretty Arcadian figures, which shepherds, of all times and countries, are supposed more or less to resemble. These external invasions, however, of the picturesque were compensated for, by



the erection, on Mr. Faber's appointment, of a far more com-  
modious house, than Dr. Bell, of educational notoriety, his  
immediate predecessor, had enjoyed. The Hospital, under Mr.  
Faber's reign, is thus described:—

'To the spacious and convenient mansion which arose upon the ruins of  
the ancient dwelling Mr. Faber finally removed, in the summer of 1834,  
and here he constantly resided during the remainder of his life; still follow-  
ing the avocations of a student, but entering freely into the hospitalities of  
the neighbourhood, though he was at all times better inclined to see his  
friends at home, than to quit his own fireside. His partner, too, loved well  
to fill her house with her friends, and delightfully she played the part of  
hostess; infusing into everything that she undertook, a spirit of vivacity  
and cheerfulness which was certain to be reflected back from others, and  
throwing over all, the exquisite charm which arises from genuine benevo-  
lence of heart. With such a mistress, it is not to be wondered at that both  
young and old found Sherburn House a favourite place of resort. It was  
seldom without company, the guests being not unfrequently persons of  
literary celebrity; and the residence of the Superior *mutatis mutandis*,  
promised to be as renowned a "Xenodochium" as the Hospital over which  
he presided.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxii.

One great charm of Mr. Faber's society consisted in his store  
of anecdotes, with which he was ever willing to entertain his  
guests. The present generation are not much given to that  
style of conversation which is understood by the expression,  
'full of anecdote.' We are very intolerant of being *bored* with  
long stories; and impatient of any prolonged attention being  
exactied by the discourse of one individual. We all want to  
join, and therefore promote the short repartee style of con-  
versation, in preference to the steady listening, which our fore-  
fathers were content to sit under, so long as they had good cheer  
before them, and a spokesman of creditable powers. We do  
not question the general improvement which has, within the  
last generation, come over the intercourse of intelligent people;  
no doubt there is more acuteness and readiness in the tone of  
ordinary conversation, more diffused information, and a more  
equal distribution of sensible talk, than in society fifty years  
ago; but this very improvement in the mass, is at the sacrifice  
of great individual talkers, whose pleasant rehearsals used, no  
doubt, to afford great satisfaction to many listeners. A little  
egotism, and the entire occupation of a whole company by one  
speaker, used to be willingly endured, if that speaker was  
pronounced deserving of attention; and therefore, the art of  
telling stories or anecdotes was studiously fostered by any  
one who had a gift that way; whereas, in these days, the ne-  
cessity of compression, and of rapidity in the details of any  
communication which passes in general society, and the fear  
of being prosy, act as a discouragement to any rising ambition  
at assuming the character of a man 'full of anecdote.' In the

case of young men, we are stringently severe on the slightest attempt to subjugate our listening powers, or to claim any large share of mental attention; but with those who have derived their habits from a former generation—who enjoy the privilege of age—we are still tolerant, partly no doubt from the respect which they claim from us, but also from the fact that they can tell stories and anecdotes more neatly and pleasantly, with more point and facility of expression, than we are accustomed to meet with in juniors. Mr. Faber would seem to have enjoyed this art, and to have had great pleasure in the exercise of it: from him a decided lead in the conversation would come as a natural right, and be acceptable to all who were enjoying the hospitality of the Hospital. The following picture is suggestive and interesting:—

‘In these pleasant reunions, which many will remember now with sorrowful pleasure, the master played his part well in the entertainment of the inmates; and a stranger might have been surprised to notice that a scholar like himself could “touch life at so many points.” His conversation, like his reading, was various and discursive, full of entertainment and instruction, and he had a rich store of racy anecdotes, always borrowing much of their effect from the manner of the narrator. This was especially the case when his stories were descriptive of provincial life and manners, for he kept up to the last his familiarity with his native dialect of Yorkshire. There were indeed few topics upon which he did not know something, so miscellaneous had been the nature of his reading, whenever abstruser studies were laid aside. He used to call himself a perfect *helluo librorum*; and it may amuse the reader to hear that he applied this epithet when detected in engaging in what he called “a course of Mrs. Radcliffe’s romances.”’—*Ibid.* p. xxxiii.

Cards the Master of Sherburn abjured, partly on principle, but chiefly, his nephew rather implies, because they interfered with conversation, that ‘divine talk,’ which he rightly held ought to be the staple amusement of intelligent beings. In order to maintain his conversational powers, he was a great devourer of all contemporaneous literature, especially romances; although, at the same time, he was so unwilling to forget anything which had ever formed part of his mental store, that a friend, one day, found him sedulously reading the whole of the plays of Euripides: on which occasion he quietly replied to some expression of astonishment, ‘It is true that I shall want these things no more, for my boys are done with; but it is always unpleasant to diminish any faculty which one once possessed; and as I am a tolerably good Grecian now, I should like to continue so.’ One of his special literary tastes was for the supernatural romance of the East. Arabian Magic or Hindoo Mythology were his delight. Oriental lore and tales of enchantment, as ‘Thalaba,’ and ‘Kehama,’ were most favourite studies. The history of the appearance of Samuel to the witch of Endor, is dwelt on at great length in the course of the book now before

us; while mysterious prophecies and visions, occurring in Scriptures, are everywhere shown to have been his favourite objects of investigation. This hardly arose from his love of mystery, as such; but rather from the pleasure of exercising his ingenuity in unravelling the mysterious element before him, and displaying to view a plain tangible result or fact. Real and acute appreciation of character as drawn by the humourist, or the depicter of common life, does not seem to have engaged his interest to that extent which we associate with the mind of a deep observer of mankind. In truth, Mr. Faber was so actively engaged in a never-ceasing round of self-occupation, that he never enjoyed those periods of reflective contemplation, which may perhaps seem at the time to be only the indulgence of an indolent mind, but which are yet productive, in some persons, of much thought and deep-seated knowledge of practical life. It was symptomatic of Mr. Faber's turn of mind, that he much preferred the romance of Southey, to the humour and the descriptive powers of Sir Walter Scott. This last author he seems wholly to have failed in appreciating. Again, of the plays of Shakspeare, he preferred the *Tempest* and *Midsummer Night's Dream*, to those which contain a more solid study of character. He abhorred Byron, except *Manfred*; and delighted much in Bulwer's '*King Arthur*.' This love of the imaginative, is stated by his nephew not to have applied to theological writers, but to have been changed in their case into a liking for a more homely style. Jeremy Taylor he was not fond of, and professed to be wearied by his exuberance of imagery; indeed, strange to say, he did not possess a copy of his works. Hooker he ranked preeminently first of English divines, and Barrow next; but the Anglican Chrysostom he placed nowhere. We are not disposed to quarrel with any one's right to assert an individual taste in this matter: much as we admire Jeremy Taylor, it is undoubtedly the case, that style sometimes carries him away into a stream of volubility which, interspersed as it is with most terrible formations of Anglo-latin phraseology, may be allowed to have its wearisome feature. Yet in spite of this we feel that not to admire Jeremy Taylor suggests the suspicion of a certain deficiency in appreciating poetical language, and especially in a person whose own style is somewhat remarkable for abrupt and broken statements, and for the want of that flow and rhythm which prose may possess as well as verse. The framework of Mr. Faber's writing is generally somewhat exposed, and his compositions are therefore open to a charge of dryness, which is not perhaps deserved when the matter and thought, used in their cause, are recognised. His syllogisms and logical machinery of a sentence, together with

a free use of emphatic symbols which encroach on the art of the typographer, rather than display the man of letters in a higher sense of the expression, all betoken a want of richness and grace of style. In fact, we suspect he had no real flow of language, but rather that he possessed an art of dotting down on paper, with considerable energy and acuteness, certain arguments and suppositions, whose sequence and consistency depended often on a violent external arrangement of parts, rather than on any internal gift of eloquence.

Yet if we thus criticise Mr. Faber's usual style of writing we must admit occasional exceptions, and are bound to redeem his habit and taste of mind from any want of refinement, or of poetry, by recording in the following extract his great love of music:—

‘Another great resource was music, which he enjoyed most thoroughly, and of which he had a considerable scientific knowledge. In the *Lyra Ecclesiastica*, published by the Rev. J. Fawcett, of Wibsey, Yorkshire, there are three of his compositions; the last of which, entitled “*Salvam fac Reginam*,” is very beautiful. Few things, indeed, were more to his mind than the society of guests distinguished for their musical talents. Upon such occasions all discussions ceased, and nothing was allowed to interfere with the claims of Euterpe. The writer well remembers, when on a visit with him at the house of a common friend, how zealously he laboured to initiate two young ladies of the party into the mysteries of thorough bass, and how interesting he made it to his pupils. In the society of his young female friends, especially if they showed any tendency towards intellectual pursuits, he always took especial pleasure: and there is perhaps no passage in his life more pleasing than that which is exhibited in his prefaces to the poems of his much-loved niece, Sophia Woodrooffe, a young lady of rare promise, to whom, when cut off in the very opening of her blossom, her parents might well have applied the motto which distinguishes the remains of Arthur Hallam—

‘*Vattene in pace, alma beata e bella.*’—*Ibid.* p. xxxvi.

In memory of this youthful poetess, an extract from her ‘*Five Garlands*,’ is mentioned in our Memoir, as deriving special interest from the connexion between the Hospital of Sherburn and her own personal history. The peculiarities of the locality form the obvious scene of this poem, while its conclusion assumes almost a prophetic character, when we hear that she was numbered with the dead a very short time after:—

‘Fair forms, and robes of radiant white  
With wreaths of orange gleaming bright  
Floated before the dazzled sight.  
But quickly did that vision wane.  
Another comes—a stately faun  
With solemn portal, and a train  
Of youthful figures gliding slow,  
In sable veil’d, and chanting low.’—*Ibid.* p. xlviii.

In the year 1844 Mr. Faber's health, which hitherto had been uniformly good, was materially affected by an obstinate cutaneous disorder. From this he himself recovered, but the care

and anxiety of his illness entirely shattered the health of Mrs. Faber, who gradually declined in strength, though even to the last she persevered in works of charity which were far above her powers. In 1851, however, Mr. Faber became a widower, and the short interval which remained in his own life is thus told:—

‘Those who were acquainted with Mr. Faber’s habits of life could not view his bereaved condition without much anxiety, knowing how he had been accustomed to entrust everything to his helpmate. But it was ordered that his loss should be repaired, so far as reparation was possible. Amongst the literary or scientific friends, whom his reputation as a man of letters procured for him, was Miss Louisa Beaufort, an Irish lady, whose acquirements rendered her a very acceptable correspondent to a man of learning. She had presented the Master with a copy of her work on the Round Towers of Ireland, being at that time unknown to him; but in this circumstance originated the friendship with herself as well as with her brother, Sir Francis, Hydrographer to the Admiralty. Upon the occasion of one of this lady’s visits, she was accompanied by her niece, Miss Marian Beaufort, who was soon on terms of affectionate intimacy with the family at Sherburn, and who was indeed a distant relative of Mrs. Faber. This young lady chanced to be still in the neighbourhood, when the approaching winter of 1851 rendered it necessary for the Master’s daughter-in-law to seek a warmer part of the Island. She had observed with much pain her mother’s fast increasing debility, and requested Miss Beaufort to spend some little time at Sherburn after her own departure, in order that Mrs. Faber might have a female companion constantly at hand. The latter only survived till the end of November; but Miss Beaufort’s intended temporary visit was changed into a permanent residence, for she most kindly consented to preside over the Master’s establishment: an arrangement the more valuable to him, as the delicacy of Mrs. William Faber’s health rendered her unable to endure a northern winter. Nothing could have been more gratifying to Mr. Faber than such a prospect, and never did result answer more completely to expectation. He was accustomed to call Miss Beaufort his adopted daughter, and, indeed, he could scarcely have regarded her with more affection had she really been his own child. During the short period which still remained of his pilgrimage, her society formed his principal comfort: she became completely identified with the family, shared the last watchings with them, and was one of those who had the privilege to stand by his death-bed. Her labour of love at Sherburn came to an end sooner than might have been anticipated, but none of Mr. Faber’s family can ever forget what he owed to this lady’s kindness, or sufficiently express the gratitude with which they must always remember her name.’—*Ibid.* pp. l. li.

In November of the year 1853, Mr. Faber had a serious bronchial attack, which was followed by a spasmodic affection of his heart. His end was now close at hand, which is thus most simply yet touchingly described by his nephew:—

‘For some days previous to the Master’s departure there had been recurring attacks of his malady, very distressing to witness, and on the evening before he died he sustained one of an unusually severe character: but it was the last, and the remaining hours of his existence were free from pain. At nine o’clock on the night in question, he expressed a wish to meet his family and household in prayer for the last time. For this purpose all his domestics assembled in his chamber, together with his son and daughter, his great-niece, Miss Eleanor Faber, Miss M. Beaufort, Mr. Hepple, and Mr. and Mrs. Prest. The chaplain offered up the usual petitions,

and in the Lord's Prayer, at the close, the voice of the dying man was at times distinctly audible. "When we rose from our knees," says one of those who were present, "he said, 'God bless you all; I have not breath to say much, but I wish you all good, most truly, most sincerely.' A never to be forgotten sight it was, to see that venerable old man, with his grey hairs, sitting so peacefully whilst his spirit was passing away." He had spoken to Mr. Prest previously of the great change which was approaching, when he said, "that if he looked to *himself*, he felt fear; but when he turned, as he could do, to Christ, all was hope." During the continuance of one of the paroxysms he whispered, "God is very good to me." And Miss Beaufort writes, "Never can I forget the emphatic manner in which he said, in that last fit of great suffering and oppression before his death, as I was wiping the damp dew from his forehead, 'Great bodily suffering, but perfect peace within.'" His mind, at one time, had probably been dwelling on those mysterious scenes which, in his last work, he had endeavoured to unfold; for he said on the last day of his life, "I am going, to be happier, and where all mystery will be taken away." The same lady adds, "I never saw anything so calmly, trustfully peaceful as he was. There was no enthusiasm, no exaggerated warmth of expression, but a perfect, quiet assurance of his own salvation and approaching happiness through the merits of his Saviour. Often and often during those last few days, he said, 'If I thought of myself, I should be wretched; but I look away from myself, and on to Christ: for well nigh sixty years he has led me in the footsteps of his flock, and I know He will not now forsake me.'" A similar sentiment he uttered, with much solemnity, to his younger son: "I desire," he said, "to bear my testimony, that I place my sole hope of salvation on the alone merits of Jesus Christ." At ten o'clock on the morning of the 27th of January, 1854, he entered into his eternal rest.—*Ibid.* pp. lv. lvi.

Thus died, in the 81st year of his age, a worthy man; whose distinguishing quality is stated by his nephew, in no light words of praise, yet well deserved by him, to have been 'plain sincerity of speech, and downright honesty of purpose.' The open frankness and independence of his biographer, disarm all personal criticisms. By temperament Mr. Faber was nervous and slightly irritable, which often conveyed to strangers a wrong idea of his character. Though by nature apprehensive and anxious about the future in secular matters, he was yet uniformly liberal in all pecuniary transactions; and it is much to his credit that he increased the stipends of the poorer livings, which were in his gift, as Master of Sherburn.

Mr. Faber's literary productions, exclusive of pamphlets, are twenty-six in number. It was always in controversy that he became most voluminous, and a friend suggested to him on one occasion, that he felt it a subject of regret for his time and energies to be so much devoted to controversies, which in the nature of the case could not be of lasting interest. In reply, he intimated a doubt whether he should have been so successful or so useful in any other line. On being then reminded of his treatise on the operations of the Holy Spirit, he answered half smiling, 'True; but the composition of that little work gave



me more trouble than any two of my longer ones.' Perhaps it would have been better if, by a little self-restraint, Mr. Faber had devoted himself more than he did to the writing of uncontroversial books, even at the risk of not leaving behind him so great a number of volumes. The book just instanced as being an exception to his general taste, has passed through many editions, and has established a position far in advance of his other writings. The nature of the controversies in which he was engaged, is indeed little calculated to give them any lasting interest: they were not undertaken from any practical idea of aiding his Church in developing and bringing to the surface, by her own struggles and her own divine power, the great mission entrusted to her. Mr. Faber was too fond of mystic speculations, to devote much time or thought to the daily work of the Church immediately around him. His ingenuity and labour were expended in crushing foreign theories and errors, while he too much overlooked the urgent need of his own Church to be raised up, by powerful constructive efforts, for the great home work that was before her. All, however, have their tastes and vocations, nor do we quarrel with Mr. Faber for pursuing that line of study, which he felt most congenial with his powers; but the fact that he was, by his own choice, much removed from the practical business of the Church, must essentially weaken his authority on some questions of the day, about which, in the latter part of his life, he expressed very strong opinions.

On many points we have to regret that Mr. Faber's influence was exerted with considerable energy to the hindrance of the Church's true interests. The boldness and independence for which he was always noted were brought to bear in their fullest development against what he denominated *Tractarianism*. This indeed was, according to the acknowledgment of his biographer, who admits it with evident regret, the characteristic of his declining years. Circumstances in his own family connexion were indeed naturally calculated to inflame his mind against what seemed to him the prevailing spirit of modern Oxford; and it was no doubt deeply mortifying and wounding to him, that a favourite nephew should actually join that Church against which it had been the mission of his whole life to hurl unceasing thunderbolts. But such is all human controversy; it is no uncommon thing for a long series of imagined victories to be all at once succeeded by some partial but irritating advantage on the part of the enemy whom we had with too much self-complacency thought to be utterly conquered. Mr. Faber's retaliation was, however, too wholesale: brilliant as were some of the present converts of Rome when pursuing their respective academical careers in Oxford, they were not the whole of Oxford, and the

number who yet remain within her walls, actively and faithfully engaged in serving the cause of their mother Church, will bear comparison with any former age of her history, in spite of all deserters. Mr. Faber's grievous complaints of Oxford arose, indeed, from the querulousness of an irritable temper on seeing the progress of events outreaching his own ideas. Yet we cannot be angry with him, for he was always honest and independent, even at the price of consistency, of which no greater proof can be given than many eccentric statements and sentiments in the book before us, which do not claim their origin from any general principles of the school he so warmly supported. We excuse him for saying, at eighty years of age, that he had only been regenerated sixty of that number; though doubtless the Vicar of Calverley duly brought him to the font of his parish church long before he could freely select his own religious course; we overlook this, because the present book is the best illustration of the extravagant results that may follow from such erroneous ideas, and such a loose way of talking.

After the space we have devoted to the biographical portion of the book before us, we cannot dwell on the work itself; nor, as a whole, do we consider that it is worthy of any lengthened review. It was a sentiment of Dr. Johnson's, that if an author has any special affection for one part of his writings more than another, it will probably be to his future credit that he should immediately destroy his pet child. We are not sure that an illustration of this sentiment is not afforded by Mr. Faber's 'Many Mansions in the House of the Father.' That it was a pet child is clearly shown in the following extract from the Memoir:—

'This work, as has been remarked, appeared in 1851, and Mr. Faber lived to see the issue exhausted. The edition to which this memoir is prefixed, was called for in the last year of his life, and an interesting note which is here subjoined, was written by the author to the publishers, on hearing of it.

' "Dear Sirs,

" "Sherburn House, Feb. 7, 1853.

" "I have to thank you for your very satisfactory letter. . .

" "They say that an author is not the best judge of his own works: and peradventure, I might have a sort of special affection for my *Many Mansions*, as the child of my old age. But I am much inclined to rate it higher than any of my former writings. In it, except occasionally in new editions, I take my leave of the public: for a man, who is rapidly approaching to eighty, may well think it time to bring his labours to an end.

" "I shall certainly be very glad to hear of another edition: and all the rather because I do not recollect that the former requires either correction or alteration, which is more than I can say of most of my former works. .

" "Believe me

" "Yours truly,

" "G. S. Faber.

" "To Messrs. Royston & Brown." —*Ibid.* p. lii.

A reference to some passages in this favourite work—which was so perfect that it required neither correction nor alteration—will, we think, in the opinion of our readers, complete the lexicographer's inference. But even if we had formed the design of noticing, as a second part of our article, the substance of this work, we should despair of our task. Amid the multiplicity of sciences, of localities, of times, of living and inanimate existences, of things known and unknown, past and future, natural and revealed, we lose that fixedness of mind and that comprehension of a main idea which are pleasant, if not necessary, in the construction of a review, however humble in design. If we rush, for the clearance and arrangement of our ideas, to the table of contents, we only find ourselves in a labyrinth, sixteen pages long, of subjects discussed, questions proposed, difficulties started, without any of the various solutions supplied ready to hand, or in such a form as at all to simplify the body of the work.

Mr. Faber delighted in mysticism, in the secrets of prophecy, and the great unknown speculations suggested by the depths of the past, and the furthest anticipations of the future; by fathomless divings towards the right and left, the above and below, of human thought, and therefore he approaches not seldom on what are altogether irrational subjects of contemplation. His love of the mystic was the affection of a combatant for his foe, or of a sportsman for his game: he delighted in it, not as a serene subject of meditation, but in order to pursue and destroy it; he thought it his vocation to solve all doubtful and confusing assumptions into plain and tangible facts, whether they refer to the past or are prospective. The world, as it were, stood before him, together with the sun, moon, and stars; he also beheld human beings, and the various productive functions of nature; invisible beings also were revealed to him, both good and bad, on authority which he credited; prophetic announcements also were given on the same authority, while human instinct and the light of science had much to reveal, all of which he was anxious to include in any system which he formed.

All these things then were his material, and the task which he undertook and imagined to be feasible was, to sort the various elements and beings before him into their proper places, and apportion to each his definite and tangible abode. In the pursuit of this laborious task he is neither carried away, from its gradual and steady progress towards solution, by any rapturous anticipation of glory on the one side, nor by the most gloomy and terrific pictures of eternal ruin on the other. A stern work was commenced, and must be finished with logical exactness, come what would; nay, even at the risk of almost exciting a smile by the sudden transformation, in the

mind of the reader, of things and ideas, hitherto altogether mystical, into the plainest and most intelligible scenes, described with the dry phraseology of science, and the most simple-minded enthusiasm of purpose. The 'Many Mansions in the House of the Father' form a subject of speculation which Mr. Faber is unwilling to pass over, as many do, under the general idea of the word heaven, with all the vague hopes and misty ideas of a future life; to define which is often thought presumptuous. Perhaps indeed it has been too much the tendency of Protestantism to discourage all attempts at judging of what is unseen by the seen, at forming ideas of the future by analogy with the present, or indeed at fixing any definite images on beings which are spiritual. Matter itself is almost pronounced evil, by a resuscitated gnosticism apparent in modern times. It is considered to be carnal-mindedness when visions of the future are framed out of anything that is connected with our present experience: all that we now see or do must be obliterated from the soul's recollection; and the reward which is to come at the end of the world is to be of a nature wholly different from any conceptions which the existing order of things is calculated to suggest, even in way of type. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body has thus become vague and confused; the intermediate state is solved by the simple process of sleep; so great has been the reaction from the Romish system of active communications between the living and the dead in purgatory, that the presence of spirits and angels surrounding our earthly life, either for good or harm, is made a topic of mere sentiment or even of hilarity, rather than a part of our real conviction as Christians. Mr. Faber was distressed at this hazy outline in that western horizon of life, which he saw before him as the great future of his own existence; he must have better defined objects of faith, or he could scarcely feel the splendour of that great consoling truth that death is swallowed up in victory.

With such convictions on his mind, he inquires first, what is meant by the 'Father's House.' This, he concludes can be no less than the great celestial universe, comprehending all created worlds. He has little difficulty in deciding on the mooted question as to whether there are inhabitants in other worlds besides our own. To imagine these spheres created for no purpose but to twinkle in our eyes, appears to Mr. Faber like the *ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα* of Æschylus. Each star, then, and planet is a mansion created for the residence of blessed and happy beings, forming part of the one great House or Temple of the uncreated Deity.

From two passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Mr. Faber conceives that he has established a strong argument for the

similarity of all the celestial bodies with our own world. Unless he can have some assurance that this is the case, his idea of there being various mansions in one great house is materially injured. The expression, 'By whom also He made the worlds,' and also, 'By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God,' are supposed to allude to the same material worlds, which are the mansions of the one great heaven. The moon and the stars, together with the earth and the sun, are the host of heaven, and that which we know of one out of this host, viz. the earth, we may, in some sort, predicate of the others. We may indeed; but what impartial critic could for an instant lay any weight on such a construction?

Among other instances of wild assertions and loose arguments, Mr. Faber claims a material body, though, as he wisely adds, of a highly attenuated nature, for the state of existence through which we pass between death and the resurrection. Scriptural proof is adduced under this head, and what will our readers imagine this consists of? The whole statement is made chiefly to rest on the appearance of Samuel, when called by the witch of Endor. Another proof is, however, added which we cannot omit. The vision which appeared to Eliphaz, the Temanite, described as an 'image before his eyes,' is supposed to have been a disembodied spirit (*probably* of Abraham, it is most strangely asserted,) with a visible and material form.

Another absurd specimen of the materialistic ideas, which seem to have haunted Mr. Faber's brain, is afforded by the analogy which S. Paul describes between the grain of wheat and the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. The statement made in the following passage we must hand over to the consideration of physiologists:—

'Now, unless the whole of this illustrative explanation be quite wide of the mark and nothing at all to the purpose, there must be in every Human Body a material germ, analogous to the material germ in a grain of wheat: a germ, I apprehend, so small, as to elude the search of the most skilful anatomist; yet a germ, absolutely indestructible, and, on the known principles of Matter, capable of *Indefinite Extension* and thus even of *Visibility*.

'From S. Paul's illustration, so much, I think, is clear and certain. But, whether the indestructible germ, be or be not, associated with the Disembodied Spirit; and whether, in a state of great expansion and consequent rareness, it does, or does not, constitute the subtle clothing or vehicle of the Disembodied Spirit: it would, I suppose, be presumptuous to determine positively. We may, however, say; that, if it be thus associated, we should possess a *physical* mean of accounting for the *scripturally* recorded *Visibility* of more than one Disembodied Spirit.'—Pp. 99, 100.

Mr. Faber's great aim and object in thus establishing the material character of man under every stage of his existence is, to prove the necessity of a future material residence, and to throw

an air of probability upon the history and the prospects of the world, which he so methodically lays down for our instruction. What then, in few words, is the history, and what are the prospects, of our globe which he would have us believe in as something not only speculative but approaching to the definite and certain? With regard to the past, he invokes geology to prove that the earth already has passed through many eras of a gradually progressive nature, separated from each other by convulsions, but springing up each time more perfect than before. So far there is nothing fresh or new in his remarks, but we confess to have been rather startled by the announcement that during these geological eras the world was governed by that angel of God, who afterwards fell and became the serpent of Eden, or the devil. The great progress indeed which was made in the earth, and the unfolding glories of its inner nature as each period of change come over it, were the very cause of Satan's fall. Inflated by the dignity of his viceregal authority, he aimed at the independence of his kingdom, and therefore was cast out. On the fall of Satan, God, Mr. Faber at once most boldly concludes, created man to be his successor, and thus he accounts, on the common principles of jealousy, for the intense hatred of Satan against our own race; a feeling which he possesses a certain power to gratify during the present state of the world.

But now for the future. As changes have taken place in the world, the traces of which are perceptible, Mr. Faber concludes that the future change foretold in Scripture will only be of a similar kind. Forthwith, therefore, he rushes into an exact and methodical account of what will take place at the last day from the influence of fire; he defines with the greatest perspicuity what will be the order of events at the second advent. The well-known passage of S. Peter, descriptive of the new heavens and the new earth is made to substantiate whatever Mr. Faber's own imagination may depict to be the future residence of man. The whole earth he conceives will be burnt, or changed by the influence of fire into a sublimated state, after which by ordinary chemical laws certain dense particles will be precipitated into the form of a crust or shell. During this process the saints will 'meet the Lord in the air,' and then return with Him to occupy the exterior of this shell, as their future heaven. Was ever heathen dream more gross and material than the picture thus broadly asserted to be the ascertained hope of our new and spiritual life?

The most painful efforts, however, which Mr. Faber indulges in, while speculating on the future, are those which relate to Satan and his angels, including of course the lost of mankind.

Mr. Faber is sternly methodical in this part of his subject,



almost as though he were engaged in an epic poem. Satan, indeed, plays no small part in the whole theory which he enunciates; for, as being the prince of the powers of the air, all his history is inalienably linked with that of earth. We have already stated, the imagined connexion between Satan and the past ages of the world. We are not, then, if we adopt this theory, to suppose that when the serpent stealthily crept into the garden of Eden, he had hitherto been a stranger to the earth. He had long known it; he had long dwelt on it; his recollections penetrated far behind that dark era of chaos, which immediately preceded the Mosaic cosmogony, and brought to his fallen state the grievous memory of better and happier times. Hence his natural malignity against man, who was created to supplant him. Struggle after struggle followed, and too many have fallen in his snares, but yet man was destined at last to triumph. When the Redeemer of the world Himself became man, then was Satan's grand effort to regain once more his kingdom; and when the Cross at length was upraised from the earth for the death of that Holy Victim, who had come down from heaven and taken upon Him our nature, then it almost appeared that Satan's day was at hand, that his hour of triumph had arrived. In Mr. Faber's rather quaint language, he found himself, however, 'considerably mistaken;' his liberty forthwith received a check, his head was bruised; though still he possessed a power to wander over the earth, leading all those astray, from their allegiance to the true God, whom he could tempt with his snares.

Such then being the condition of Satan and his host in the present age of divine dispensations, we have next to contemplate his future actions, and also his eternal portion. During the Millennium, Mr. Faber supposes him to be literally bound in the Domdaniel caverns of the earth, from which at the end of that period he is once more released, to enjoy a brief but terrible despotism; till at last, the final catastrophe dissolves the whole earth, ends his power for all ages, and leaves him in the eternal punishment, which is allotted to him by divine justice. And where is the dungeon in which Satan, with his evil hosts, and with all lost mankind, are to be for ever confined? Here Mr. Faber gives us the complement of Burnet's wild speculations, and presents us with what might not unjustly be termed '*Telluris Theoria Diabolica.*' Mr. Faber, while engaged on this most awful topic, seems to revel in the wildest horrors of a diseased imagination, with Miltonian zest; made all the more striking by the cool and technical method of his descriptions. After stating, as we have already said, that the fire of judgment will remodel the earth into a large hollow shell, through which there will never more be an opening between

the exterior and interior, he proceeds to make accurate calculations about the capability of this interior to form for ever the penal abode of the lost. Let the following passage suffice to illustrate this part of the subject:—

‘If, then, there should be *even no* enlargement of our Planet’s diameter in the process of its renovation, when the Shell of the New Earth occupies the position of the Shell of the Old Earth; *still*, as now, that diameter would be eight thousand miles. Taking this measure as the basis of our calculation, let us suppose the Shell of the New Earth to be of the uniform thickness of a thousand miles. On such a supposition, we shall have an interior hollow Space of six thousand miles in diameter. Hence, if we ascribe a diameter of two thousand miles (which is a trifle less than the diameter of the Moon) to an Ignited Central Nucleus: we shall finally have a circular Space, of two thousand miles in every radiating direction, between the Central Nucleus and the Interior Face of the Shell.

‘Thus ample will be the lurid Space even on the *present* conjectural reckoning. But the probability is, that our Renovated Planet will, in its diameter, be very considerably enlarged. We have, indeed, no reason to believe, that a single particle of *new* Matter, either has been, or will be, added to our Globe, since its original creation out of nothing: yet, if the specific gravity of the *whole* be diminished by an enlargement of the lurid Space between the Fiery Central Ruin of the Old World and the circumscribing Shell which will constitute the New Earth of the Blessed, this Shell itself being diminished proportionably either in thickness or in material solidity; a fearfully sufficient amplitude of room will be provided for the Infernal Prison of the Damned.

‘How the supposed Space, between the solid Centrical Nucleus and the inferior Side of the Circumscribing Shell which acts as an enormous arch, will be occupied, must, to a certain extent, be a matter of conjecture. It is, however, probable (and the probability may seem to be confirmed by SCRIPTURE), that this vast Space will be filled with liquid fire, forming a sort of circumambient Ocean to the Continent of the solid Centrical Ignited Nucleus. Such may be, what in SCRIPTURE is styled, more than once, the LAKE of Fire and Brimstone: a fiery DELUGE, as our great poet speaks, fed with ever-burning sulphur unconsumed.’—Pp. 257—259.

With all the respect that is due to Mr. Faber’s talents and personal character, can we describe him as otherwise than a melancholy enthusiast, when after having written such passages as the foregoing, he concludes the book in which they appear, with the following solemn words?—

‘As I approach the confines of another state of existence; as the blossoms of the grave have now long whitened my head; I sensibly feel my footsteps strengthened, my hopes elevated, and my consolations increased, by that *definiteness* which God has so graciously imparted in his HOLY WORD. On the verge of Eternity, I have the sensation of a sure footing: and I trust, that it makes me a better man, to have ascertained *definitely* the LOCALITIES of what, through Christ’s Merits, may be my Future Progress, instead of plunging into Regions of Unknown Space with no antecedent clearness of conception.’—P. 423.

Let it not be supposed, from the tone in which we have criticised the work before us, that we condemn all speculation on the things which are unseen. Scripture plainly leads us on

to the subject, and by its prophetic announcements would seem to give its sanction to the reverent consideration of a future state. Nor, again, do we think that the investigations of physical science are to be without their influence in any judgments we may form. The laws of analogy also must have their force, and it is natural that we picture the scenes of a heavenly condition in some measure from the better parts of our present experience. It is an allowable, and indeed, a happy thought, that our future state is not to be one of entire change from all our present associations, but that the brighter elements of the present world, those, which in the beginning were pronounced very good, will survive the last fiery trial, and be our companions in eternity. To believe otherwise would deprive the present world of half its charms and all its glory, for it would drive us to the conclusion that all matter was in itself evil. God created the world with far too many signs of His greatness impressed upon it, for us to believe that the inherent powers of beauty and of increase, which all things contain, are to be wasted and destroyed: it is no mere common-place or unreal sentiment that the beauties of nature, nay, the flowers of the world, whether literal or figurative, are a foretaste and a type of heaven.

What, however, we do most seriously object to is, turning such speculations into little better than a burlesque of holy and unknown things. On subjects which are meant to be shrouded in mystery, or only approached in the dim religious light of a well-ordered and deeply poetic fancy, it is simply ridiculous to assume the dry technical language of exact description. We cannot therefore acquit the author of such random speculations as are contained in the book before us, from the charge of lamentable irreverence. Little, indeed, was it his purpose to write otherwise than with becoming dignity on the topics which he undertook; but in this fact we only see another instance of a very common failing in active-minded men, viz., that they are often wholly unconscious of their true vocation. The study of religious speculation belongs to the higher class of poetic minds, and is only tolerable when thus treated. It is needless to add that Mr. Faber, however estimable he was, whatever talents he possessed, was not thus qualified for the task. The result therefore will be deemed, we think, a painful failure in the estimation of thoughtful and considerate persons.

---

**ART. III.—1.** *First Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners, appointed Nov. 10, A.D. 1852, to inquire into the State and Condition of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1854. With an Appendix.*

**2.** *Cathedral Reform. A Letter to the Members of his Diocese, from WALTER KERR, Bishop of Salisbury, &c. London: Rivingtons.*

IT must be confessed, that the Reformed Church of England has hitherto exhibited but an imperfect conception of the uses of religious corporations. Whether it be the marriage of the clergy, or the domestic turn of the national mind, or whatever other cause, that hinders the development among us of the collegiate—not to say cœnobitical—life, it is certain that our ideas of clerical efficiency have been almost exclusively connected with parochial and pastoral ministrations. Valuing our Reformation on its retention of capitular establishments, which the ultra-Protestant movement would have swept away as little better than monkery, we have been always at some loss to know what to do with them. Pious people often tremble for the spirituality of a favourite clergyman when honoured with a Cathedral preferment; and every one is on the watch to prevent dignities which are tolerated—perhaps justified—as parts of a system which must adapt itself to all grades of society, from encroaching too far on the more important avocations of the Christian priesthood. Nor is this altogether a modern jealousy. It is an inheritance perhaps from the days of the Reformation, when the corruptions of religious houses, regarded by eyes which longed—as Bishop Fisher told the House of Lords—for the *goods* more than the *good* of the Church, precipitated a catastrophe, little likely to leave the public mind in an impartial frame towards collegiate institutions. The traces of it are evident in the Canons of 1603, drawn up under Bancroft with the avowed object of sustaining Church principles. While enjoining a variety of directions for the due performance of parochial duties, these Canons are almost silent on the subject of Cathedral reform. An order for the use of *copes*<sup>1</sup> seems but poorly seconded by directions to celebrate Holy Communion ‘upon *principal* feast days,’ and so as for every member of the foundation to receive ‘four times yearly at the least.’ Beyond this, the most that seemed then expected from Cathedral Chapters, was that some of their number should assist the bishop in examining and

---

<sup>1</sup> Canon xxiv.

ordaining priests<sup>1</sup>—a regulation feebly enjoined, and vigorously neglected; that the dean should reside ninety days *conjunctim aut divisim* (unless dispensed with by the bishop), keep hospitality, and see that the vicars-choral study the Scriptures;<sup>2</sup> that both he and the canons should *preach* while in residence (yet in other churches as well as in the Cathedral);<sup>3</sup> and, finally, that they should inform the bishop of any unsound doctrine preached in their pulpit.<sup>4</sup> This is certainly a very moderate amount of duty in return for noble emoluments; and such appears to have been the opinion of those who enjoined it. For the Forty-fourth Canon *inhibits* prebendaries not residentiary from absenting themselves from their benefices, 'under colour of their prebends;' and further enjoins the residentiaries so 'to sort and proportion' the residence among them (which by the statutes should be kept by all in common), as 'presently to repair to their benefices, or some one of them, or to some other charge where the law requireth their presence, there to discharge their duties according to the laws in that case provided.' The notion plainly was, that Cathedrals only kept the clergy away from more necessary duties: and this is the notion stamped on all subsequent legislation. A Cathedral dignity is a lucrative preferment without any real employment. The rights of the patron and the doctrine of 'prizes,' form the chief reasons for its retention; and the efforts of reform are directed towards preventing too many of them from accumulating to one man's share, or to seeing that his legalised *otium* does not detain the prize-holder too long from the more genuine obligations of a clergyman. Hence our royal statutes and episcopal injunctions have been mostly directed to restraining instead of enforcing residence,—to narrowing instead of extending corporate action. In the true spirit of such legislation, a bishop still living is said, as a matter of conscience, to bestow his Cathedral preferment upon those claimants on his patronage, whom he considers the least qualified for the more important responsibility of a parochial charge!

The legislation of later years is assuredly not to be complimented on exhibiting any deeper insight into the uses of Cathedral establishments. The framers of the Ecclesiastical Commission in 1835 might be thought to have adopted as the basis of their reforms Rob Roy's morality—

' . . . . . the good old rule,  
Sufficeth them, the simple plan,  
That they should take, who have the power,  
And they should keep who can.'

Money was urgently required for the augmentation of poor

---

<sup>1</sup> Canon xxxv.

<sup>2</sup> Canon xlii.

<sup>3</sup> Canon xlii.

<sup>4</sup> Canon li.

benefices, and the increase of parochial ministrations; the Cathedrals had money, with no duties which the public cared for, to discharge; all the Commission had to do was to seize upon these revenues, and apply them to the more imperative wants of the Church. The process would occasion a sad diminution in the number and splendour of clerical 'prizes;' but as 'existing interests' were to be respected, the loss would chiefly affect the future *patronage*, and this the Crown and the bishops made up their minds to submit to. Sir R. Peel, in his place in Parliament, went so far as to compliment the hierarchy on the 'sacrifices' thus made for the good of the Church; though in truth not a single bishop or canon was in any degree injured, while some were largely benefited by the scheme. The loss fell on their unnamed successors, and yet more heavily upon the people who should have benefited by foundations thus directed to another use. No inquiry was instituted, whether the Cathedrals themselves were capable of being invested with a more extended usefulness, or whether any of the 'existing rights' so scrupulously preserved, might not be flagrant abuses demanding correction by the visitor. No one, either, seems to have much cared what would become of these establishments when the process of depletion should be complete;—all such considerations were disregarded in the one idea of a fund for parochial purposes. In the well-remembered language of the energetic prelate who championed the design, 'the wants of the flock' were so urgent, that he must have all the money he could lay 'his hands upon.' Hence a deaf ear was turned to the remonstrances of the few who appreciated the spiritual value of capitular establishments. The deans and chapters themselves were only listened to when they could urge some personal pecuniary claim; and too many of these dignitaries—like the witty canon of S. Paul's—dropped their protest as soon as their bargain was made, turned their backs on the sacred rights so solemnly obtested, and contentedly swam with the stream.

After this sort a measure was hurried through Parliament, which it has been the fashion to style a great ecclesiastical reform. That some advantages have resulted, it would be foolish to deny; but at what cost were they purchased? The Ecclesiastical Commission has unsettled a vast amount of ancient foundations; familiarized men's minds with an enormous traffic in church-lands, livings, and jurisdictions; occasioned no little scandal against particular dignitaries; and proved a 'good thing' to the solicitors and speculators, who have enjoyed the stewardship of ecclesiastical manors, and the fingering of ecclesiastical moneys.

On the other hand, as a scheme for augmenting poor benefices,



it has notoriously failed. It has been obliged to suspend even its own moderate promises to benefices in public patronage, and now only deals with the few which possess a local claim on the revenues coming under its disposal. Its one work, in short, is the endowment of the 'Peel districts;' and, without undervaluing the impetus thus given to church building, or the yet more praiseworthy efforts of the many zealous and self-denying clergymen, who have laboured and died in these home missionary fields, we have yet to be satisfied,—1st, that one bishop, at 5,000*l.* a-year, and a multitude of district incumbents at 150*l.*, constitute the best ecclesiastical establishment for a wealthy manufacturing town in the nineteenth century:—and, 2dly, that the assistance proffered to such towns by spoliating the religious foundations of other places, has not tended to prevent the application of their overflowing wealth to new endowments of their own.<sup>1</sup>

To whatever extent, however, the Ecclesiastical Commission may have proved advantageous to the *parochial* branch of the Church's system, it can assuredly lay little claim to the credit of any *Cathedral* reform. In this respect its idea was simple even to coarseness. The majority of the Cathedrals were perceived

---

<sup>1</sup> The public is little aware of all that goes to the completion of one of these 'New Parishes.' The districts are severed from the mother Church at the first stroke, and constituted independent cures. They consist, for the most part, of large masses of labouring and pauper population, sunk in spiritual, intellectual, and material destitution. We know a manufacturing town in which *nine* of these districts, containing from five to eight thousand souls a-piece, were thus cut off at once from the parish church and the vicar. Some of them received ministers of their own, who forthwith began the hard struggle to erect a church; others lay vacant for three or four years—a greater spiritual waste than ever—and were at last given away in despair to any one in priest's orders who could be got to accept them. Such clergymen, with their miserable stipends, their pauper population, their wretched 'licensed rooms,' assembling three or four old women—on rare occasions, perhaps a dozen—for Divine service on the Sunday, are the embodiment of meanness in religion. Even the most successful results are sometimes achieved at a fearful price. An ardent young curate is induced to exchange his happy employment for one of these destitute incumbencies. His first object is, of course, a church. By spending and being spent, annoying his friends, irritating his acquaintance, and experiencing rebuffs which would mortify a bankrupt tradesman, he gets heavily forward with a subscription. Then he begins the work, entangles himself in contracts, spends his wife's two or three hundred pounds, (his own has gone in taking his degree,) and *dies*, broken-hearted and insolvent, before the church is completed. Another, and another yet, may succeed to the charge and continue the struggle, before the edifice, all meanly furnished and saddled still with debt, is declared ready for consecration. And then the bishop's sermon will, perhaps, call on the congregation to rejoice in the rapid extension of the Church; while a couple of widows and a dozen of fatherless children are ruing the bitter day when the poor victims (now forgotten by all but them) cast themselves beneath the wheels of her chariot. Meantime, the laity, in many places, exasperated by the impertunity of these clerical *duns*, are demanding that no more clergymen be appointed than there are churches to officiate in. It is certainly a grievous defect that the *parishioners* are allowed no voice in these rearrangements of parochial bounds and spiritual relations.

to possess two sorts of canons or prebendaries,—the one residentiary, the other not,—the former burdened with no very important duties, the latter with none at all. The residentiaries, again, varied in number and emolument in different Cathedrals; and deaneries were found to range from 600*l.* a-year to hard upon 5,000*l.* Let the deans be equalized at 1,000*l.* a-year, and the residentiaries at 500*l.*; perhaps as much as public opinion would 'stand' for dignities confessedly of no great practical utility. Let there be *four* residentiaries in every Cathedral,—one for each of the four seasons—and abolish the non-residentiary members altogether: their duties—the duties they might, could, would, or should have done—to be thrown to the winds, their patronage to escheat to the bishops, and their endowments, with the surplus revenue from the residentiaries, to form the fund for pastoral extension. Such, with a little garnishing in the case of two or three Cathedrals, where the larger *haul* seemed to warrant a little more liberality, was the scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commission. No consideration was given to differences in the original foundation; all difficulties connected with the statutes being surmounted by a summary power of repeal granted to the Chapters themselves. Neither were local circumstances deemed worthy of any greater discrimination. No larger Chapter was provided for the metropolitical city of York than for the country town of Wells,—the Cathedral being of no very definite advantage (it must have been surmised) to either. On the other hand, a *fourth* residentiary was set up at Lincoln, where the statutes required but three: and the whole four were imported into Ripon, which had never enjoyed nor discovered the want of any! Such additions in violation of the leading 'principle'—money for pastoral purposes—could only have been introduced on the profound theory of uniformity which obtains in the *compo* style of church architecture:—unless, indeed, it was thought that one bishop ought to have as many 'prizes' to bestow as another.

It was happily suggested by somebody, that since the money only was needed for the Ecclesiastical Commission, they might be content, with regard to the non-residentiary stalls, to

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop of Ripon actually complains of this importation, as *injurious to the Cathedral congregation*, who are positively suffering from an *embarras de richesses*:—'I cannot refrain from observing, that experience convinces me of the disadvantage that results to the spiritual interests of a parish church, such as Ripon Minster, from the great variety and frequent change of preachers. In truth, with us they are so many, and the several parties are so willing, that the great difficulty is to find turns enough to satisfy all. I should only have aggravated this embarrassment by the appointment of honorary canons: and this is one reason why I have hitherto refrained from exercising my privilege of creating them. I cannot but feel that the poor and less educated are *sufferers* by the multiplication of preachers, as systematic and consecutive teaching becomes impossible.'—App. p. 591.

'take all they had, and spare their lives.' The dignity would still be acceptable to deserving clergymen, if conferred only as an honorary mark of professional merit. It was, as a living Bishop expresses it, a stall without a manger. The idea took prodigiously: the bishops were glad of small change to pay off some of the claimants on their patronage, and Parliament was so tickled with the notion of a Cathedral dignitary *gratis*, that they extended the privilege to *all* the bishops, by founding 'honorary canonries'—the one ecclesiastical foundation of the nineteenth century—in the Cathedrals which possessed no non-resident prebends.

As it happened, however, this preservation of the non-resident stalls was something more than a feather in clerical caps. The bishops, it is true, forgot to restore the patronage which, on the notion of the suppression of the prebends, had been transferred to themselves; but all other rights and duties, according to the existing statutes of the Cathedral, were preserved by the act of Parliament. Hence the corporate bodies have remained un-mutilated, and, the power of repealing whatever did not accord with this crude legislation having been but sparingly exercised, the means are still providentially retained for effecting a more genuine measure of Cathedral reform.

To this inquiry attention has at last been directed, in a manner commensurate with its importance. One of the few instances in which Lord Derby's short-lived administration fulfilled the expectations it had excited in the minds of many Churchmen, was the issue of the Royal Commission, whose First Report is now lying before us: and we cannot forbear from noting, as a proof how such measures are appreciated by the clergy, that the Address to the Throne which the Archbishop of York prevented his Convocation from adopting in Synod, and which they were consequently compelled to submit to Her Majesty as individuals, selected this act of her royal authority for grateful acknowledgment.<sup>1</sup>

The Cathedral Commission, avoiding the fatal mistake of their predecessors, began by seeking to acquire a true conception of the actual constitution of the several capitular bodies, with the objects had in view by their founders, the modifications subsequently introduced, and the practice at the present time. For this purpose they addressed a series of questions to

<sup>1</sup> 'We recognise the same pious and affectionate care for the practical efficiency of the Church, in the desire, which your Majesty has ever evinced, to render our ecclesiastical establishments more conducive to the purposes for which they have been founded—the glory of God, and the edification of his people.' The first signature to this Address is 'Charles Thorpe, Archdeacon of Durham;' and among those which follow, are those of the proctor for the Chapter of Carlisle, a canon-residentary of Ripon, and three non-resident canons of York.

the several chapters, precentors, and organists; applied themselves to an analysis of their statutes, and also to the study of other authorities calculated to throw light upon the objects of their search. The First Report, which is now before us, states the course and general results of these judicious inquiries, and furnishes an analysis of the information and suggestions obtained from the Chapters, under the seven heads of, *Public Worship, Religious Education, Discipline, Erection of New Sees, Other Arrangements for the Discharge of Episcopal Duties, Fabric, and Revenue*. On all these topics a mass of information is collected in the Report and its voluminous Appendix, on which the Commissioners reserve their recommendations, till the evidence has been completely collected, digested, and weighed.

Here, then, we have the opening, at least, for such a reform as has never yet been attempted. The operations of the Ecclesiastical Commission, it may be feared, will already have diverted from many of the Cathedral establishments so large a portion of their revenues, as seriously to cripple any scheme of adequate efficiency; but it may at least be hoped that the endowments still remaining, to which the eye of spoliation has already been directed, will be honestly applied to the purposes to which the whole was solemnly devoted at the altars of the respective Cathedrals.

Our Cathedrals are generally distinguished into two classes, called the *Old* and the *New* Foundations: the former comprehending the churches originally founded for canons secular; the latter, such as were transferred from the regular orders at the Reformation, with the new Cathedrals then and subsequently founded. The churches of the Old Foundation are thirteen:—York, S. Paul's, Chichester, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln, Salisbury, Wells; and the Welsh Cathedrals, S. Asaph, Bangor, Llandaff, and S. David's. The *conventual* churches are Canterbury, Durham, Carlisle, Ely, Norwich, Rochester, Winchester, and Worcester; which, though dignified with episcopal sees before the Reformation, were administered by *monastic* Chapters. The Cathedrals founded with new sees by Henry VIII. are Bristol, Peterborough, Oxford, Gloucester, and Chester. And to these are to be added the two collegiate churches of Ripon and Manchester, which have been converted into Cathedrals in our own day. A general uniformity prevails throughout the charters and statutes of each class: and to give a proper idea of each, the Commissioners have printed extracts from the statutes of some one or more, including the statutes in full of Lichfield, Ely, Chester, and Westminster.

The Cathedrals of the Old Foundation are assigned to a period extending from the Conquest to the Reformation. In these the bishop was the pre-eminent authority, being usually the founder, and always the visitor and chief legislator. The following is a general description of these foundations:—

‘The Dean and Chapter are only amenable to the Bishop’s jurisdiction as a body, in chapter assembled. All offences of individual members are corrected by the authority of the Dean, according to the capitular Statutes.

‘The four first members next after the Bishop, are called “*Personæ Principales*,” and are bound to continual residence, each having his distinct sphere of duty.

‘The DEAN, elected by the Chapter, summoned for that purpose, was next to the Bishop in honour and authority, to be revered and obeyed by all the members of the Church. To him was assigned a part of the daily divine offices, the cure of souls in the precinct, the chief care of discipline and morals, and archidiaconal authority over all the churches in the cathedral city. He also exercised the same authority, either alone, or conjointly with the Chapter, over the churches annexed to prebends and those appropriated to the Chapter. (In some Cathedrals there was a Sub-Dean, to act for the Dean in his absence;<sup>1</sup> in others, the duty of the Dean devolved on the Precentor.)

‘The PRECENTOR, next in rank to the Dean, was charged with the regulation and direction of the divine services, assigning to each person his proper part, and leading the choir, either personally or by his *Succentor*. He was answerable for the instruction and discipline of the choristers, and for the selection of fit candidates to supply vacancies. To him belonged the care of providing and correcting the manuscript music for the service of the church, and keeping the books in proper condition.

‘To the CHANCELLOR was committed the department of theology, and learning in general. It was his duty to superintend the reading of the Scriptures in the Choir, and to see that they were well and distinctly read; to preach, and to arrange the cycle of preachers, both in the Cathedral Church and elsewhere; to deliver theological lectures; to nominate schoolmasters in the city, and in other places; to preserve the sacred books used in the choir, and the library of the church; to keep the chapter seal (in conjunction with the Treasurer); to write the letters of the Chapter, and a record of all proceedings. This office is quite distinct from that of the Chancellor of the diocese. He was assisted in these duties by the *Vice-Chancellor*, or *Scribe*.

‘The TREASURER was the guardian of the fabric and all the furniture and ornaments of the Church; he was bound to furnish at his own expense some of the requisites for the divine services; to him belonged the superintendence of the inferior ministers of the church. His assistant was the *Sacrist* or *Sub-Sacrist*.

‘The ARCHDEACONS, who in the former period seem to have been attached to the Bishop, as his assistants at home and abroad, without any distinct sphere of jurisdiction, began soon after the Conquest to have each a certain province, with duties similar to those which they exercise at this time. Being much occupied with the visitation of churches in their several districts, they were allowed to keep a shorter term of residence than

---

<sup>1</sup> This *Sub-Dean* is not however to be confounded with the *Vice-Dean* in Cathedrals of the New Foundation, who is always one of the Canons, and next in rank to the Dean.—See p. 352.

the other Canons, but were obliged to maintain a Vicar. In the Church of St. Paul's, London, they appear to have had precedence next to the Dean, in other churches after the Four Principal Persons. They were enjoined to hold rural Chapters in the several deaneries of their districts, and there to deliver to the rural Deans and parochial Clergy the injunctions issued by the General Council.

'The CANONS consisted of Presbyters, Deacons, and Sub-deacons, each prebendal stall being annexed to one of those three orders of ministry; and a certain number of each order, as the services of the Church then required, were enjoined to be always resident together. It appears to have been a general rule, that a certain part of the whole body of Canons should be always in residence.

'Each Canon was bound to maintain a *Vicar* skilled in music, to supply his place when absent, in the ministrations of the Church. This seems to be the origin of the Minor Canons.

'The ancient Statutes are full of regulations for the solemn worship of Almighty God, especially on Sundays and high festivals, and other important occasions, assigning certain portions of the divine offices to the Bishop, Dean, and other members. Sermons are to be preached, either by the Bishop or some other member of the Church, especially the Chancellor, to the people on every Lord's day; to the Clergy in Chapter assembled on week days, (at particular seasons,) and on certain festivals. The cycle of sermons is arranged by the Chancellor, with the sanction of the Bishop.

'The Four Principal Persons, and the Archdeacons, had each a separate endowment either of land or tithes; they were also sometimes (not always) endowed with one of the prebends of the church. The prebends varied much in number, the Cathedral of Lincoln having the largest number, fifty-two. The Canons had each a prebend,<sup>1</sup> the endowment of which generally consisted of the tithes of some parish.

'There was, besides, a common property of the Church, called *Communa*, from the revenues of which the several members received a daily distribution, when resident and taking their part in the divine offices. The Bishop sometimes had a portion of this *Communa*; the share of the Dean was double that of a Canon,'—*Report*, pp. vi. vii.

In addition to their duties of daily recurrence, the Chapter formed the council of the bishop in the administration of the diocese, especially *contra hæreses et schismata*. Frequent notices of such councils, as well as of the diocesan synod, are to be found in Wilkins's 'Concilia,' and meetings appear to have been held at Salisbury, under the presidency of the bishop, on several occasions since the Reformation. This council consisted of course of the *whole* Chapter; the distinction of residentiary and non-residentiary canons being of later date, and never affecting this part of the capitular functions.

The Chapters were also anciently guardians both of the temporalities and spiritualities of the see during a vacancy; and by the provisions of Magna Charta, were to elect their bishop free from external dictation. This privilege, however, as is well

<sup>1</sup> It should be remembered the *canon* was a name of office and ministry; *prebenda* signified an endowment or revenue, the person enjoying which was called *prebendarius*.



known, was perpetually interfered with, both by the pope and the monarch.

In these Chapters (it has been observed) there was originally no distinction between resident and non-resident canons. All were alike designed to keep residence, serve the church, and live at the common table; and none were to be absent from the Cathedral, but with leave of the body or the bishop. In process of time, however, this rule was modified. 'As early as 'A.D. 1319, (say the Chapter of Salisbury,) irregularities had 'crept into the body, and residence was ill kept.' Orders were then issued for *one-fourth* of the whole body to reside in rotation each quarter of the year. In another century, this grew to be the same individuals (in number one-fourth of the whole), residing all the year round, while the other three-fourths were permanently absent. The causes of these changes are said to be, the expense of keeping hospitality while in residence, and the desire of the canons to look after their separate prebends. A contribution was not unfrequently levied from the non-residents of one-fifth, one-sixth, or one-seventh of these prebends, for the benefit of the common estate. In this manner *canons-residentiary* came to be established in all the Cathedrals, and (though at first it was otherwise) they gradually excluded the non-resident members from their voice in the chapter, which managed the common estate and directed the service of the church. This continued for the most part down to the beginning of the Reformation. A remarkable statute was then issued by Henry VIII. to the Cathedral of York, which forms part of its governing laws at the present day. After severely rebuking the luxury and idleness of the canons in residence, the royal reformer proceeds as follows:—

'Statuimus quod omnes et singuli canonici ejusdem ecclesiæ, etiam non residentiarii, quos tunc in civitate nostrâ Eborum adesse contigerit, ad omnia acta capitularia, seu alias ipsam ecclesiam vel capitulum tangentia, vocentur; et de eorundem canonicorum tunc presentium seu majoris partis consensu, omnia acta predicta tractentur et expediantur, aliorum absentium et monitorum contumaciis non obstantibus, cum constat eosdem canonicos etiam non residentiarios fratres et membra ejusdem ecclesiæ esse, ac capitulum ejusdem ecclesiæ cum cæteris canonicis facere.'—*Appendix*, p. (18).

By this opportune enactment, the non-resident canons of York enjoy their seats in chapter to the present day;—being, we believe, the only Cathedral in which that privilege is retained. Even here, however, the residentiary influence seems to have been exerted after the old spirit; for one of the Injunctions issued by the late Archbishop of York on the occasion of his celebrated visitation, A.D. 1841, enforces the observance of this very statute, which it had been attempted

to set aside. And still, we are told, the common mode of obeying it is to place a citation on the chapter-house door, where the canons can but seldom know of its existence: so that not only are the non-resident members not offered the opportunity of coming to York, but when actually in the city and even attending the church, Chapters have been held on important matters without their knowledge. There is no question, however, of the *right*; and as the other Cathedrals of the Old Foundation are similarly constituted, it may be concluded that, at the time of the Reformation, all the canons possessed *de jure* an equal voice in the chapter, while a certain number, (ordinarily a fourth of the whole,) together with one of the *quatuor personæ*, were expected to be in *constant* residence.

The Cathedrals of Winchester, Worcester, Canterbury, Durham, and Rochester, were also originally founded for canons secular; but in the two former, by the influence of Dunstan, and in the others by that of Lanfranc, these were replaced by monks. Norwich was founded as a Benedictine convent; and became a Cathedral by the translation of the see from Thetford; while the sees of Ely and Carlisle were founded (*temp.* Hen. I.) in monasteries already existing in those cities. In these eight churches, then, the prior and his monks formed the cathedral chapter, retaining, of course, the rule of their order. In this capacity they acted as the bishop's council, and discharged the other functions of a dean and chapter much as in the old Cathedrals.

On the abolition of the regular Orders under Henry VIII. new statutes were framed by royal authority for the government of these churches, which, together with those of the bishoprics then founded, constitute what are called the Cathedrals of the New Foundation. They are distinguished from the Old Foundation by containing a much smaller body of canons; the highest number being twelve, the lowest four; corresponding to the number of *residentiaries* in the other Cathedrals. Of the *quatuor personæ*, who filled so high a dignity in the older scheme, they retain only the dean, who is appointed immediately by the Crown, instead of being elected, as in the others, under a *congé d'élire*. In some cases, also, the Crown or the Lord Chancellor has the nomination of the canons in these Cathedrals. The dean has no longer the jurisdiction over the city churches, the archdeacons are not members of the chapter, and the precentor, (like the succentor vicariorum in the other churches,) subsides into a minor canon.

In the churches of the New Foundation there are no separate endowments of particular stalls, but the whole is common property. All the canons were bound to perpetual residence, with

an allowance of 100 days' absence to the dean, and eighty to a canon, provided that one-third or one-fourth part of the number were always present. In other respects, the Chapters of the New Foundation are enjoined to the same duties with the Old; the daily offering of prayer and praise, with hymns and chanting, and diligent preaching, being particularly mentioned. The principal distinction appears to be, that no express provision is made for the bishop taking part in divine service, nor is he invariably the visitor.

We may infer from these features in the New Foundations what was now the standard idea of Cathedral establishments. The bishop had greatly loosened the intimate union formerly subsisting between himself and the Chapter, and through the Chapter with the diocese. The dean had absorbed into his own office the duties and influence anciently shared by the precentor, chancellor, and treasurer; the non-resident canons were practically excluded from the Chapter, and the resident body had assumed more the air of a distinct order in the Church, independent to some extent both of the bishop and the diocese, and possibly intended to sustain the influence of the Crown, as the monks had supported that of the pope. Still *collective* residence was enjoined; the duty of hospitality, and the relief of the poor, were enforced; and the Chapter was declared to be, after the example of the primitive Church, 'assistant to the bishop, as his presbytery in all weightier matters, and specially that heresies and false doctrines may be checked and expelled.'

Cranmer, it is well known, laboured hard to invest the Cathedrals with some of that care for sacred learning which, amid many faults, had ever distinguished the religious orders. He would have attached to them diocesan colleges of theology, and grammar-schools; and to such objects, as well as to the augmentation of poor benefices, and the extension of the episcopate, he proposed to devote a large proportion of the spoil of the monasteries. But these proposals were only very partially complied with. Provision is made in some statutes for the maintenance of a small number of students at the universities, but it does not appear to have generally taken effect.

Such, then, were our Cathedrals at the beginning of the Reformation, when the Church Ritual was as yet but little altered, and the celibacy of the clergy was still largely maintained. From this time to the reign of Charles II. a variety of amendments were introduced by royal and episcopal ordinances, which gradually changed the whole aspect of affairs.

'What had been the exception before, now becomes the rule. What had been the term allowed for necessary absence during the year, becomes now the term of residence at the Cathedral Church—ninety, sixty, and

even so little as fifty days; and in many cases the provision for the constant presence of one-third or one-fourth part of the Canons, appears to have been abandoned.'—*Report*, p. xii.

Thus, in the Statutes of Canterbury, as framed by Henry VIII., the chapter *De Residentia Decani* begins in this way:—

'Quia vigilantiori rectoris oculo nihil est utilius ut omnia recte gubernentur, statuimus et volumus ut decanus *semper* domi apud ecclesiam suam resideat, nisi illum removetur impedimentum legitimum.'—*Appendix*, p. (57).

But in Charles I.'s statute, after the same preamble, on the necessity for the watchful eye of the ruler, follows this 'lame and impotent conclusion':—

'Ut decanus per *nonaginta ad minus dies* in singulis annis domi apud ecclesiam hanc nostram resideat, quorum viginti unum continuos esse volumus.'—*Ibid*.

In like manner, the chapter *De Residentia Canonicorum* commences in both statutes with the preamble, '*quandoquidem membra a capite procul sejungi non convenit*,' and so ordains equal residence on the canons with the dean: but this is first reduced from '*semper*' to the same period of ninety days, and then ordained to be so parted among them, that a fourth part at least of the prebendaries (*i. e.* three) be always personally resident.

So, again, in the other metropolitanical church of York. At the Reformation the number of canons in residence is said to have been 'left uncertain:' *i. e.* probably, that it was not to fall below *nine*, (the fourth part of the canons,) exclusive of the dean; and any or all of the whole number might come into residence when they pleased, by protesting in the form prescribed by a statute of Henry VIII. This continued the law till after the Revolution, when by a statute of William III. the number of residentiaries was reduced to *five*, including the dean. Still the ancient method of 'protesting residence' continued, so that on a vacancy among the four, any other canon who first notified his intention to the dean became *ipso facto* the new residentiary. It was not till the reign of George III. that the non-resident members were deprived of this opportunity, by a statute which gives the dean a power of *selection* from among their number: and thus we are landed again in the period of modern legislation.

The Ecclesiastical Commission of 1835 was directed to consider 'the several Cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as might render them conducive to the efficiency of the 'Established Church.' These last words they seem to have interpreted to mean, 'the diversion of the largest amount of Cathedral endowments to more important uses.' For in regard

to the efficiency of the Cathedrals themselves, the chief reform they accomplished was restoring the residence of the dean to eight months in the year, with a restriction from holding any other benefice, save in the Cathedral city and not exceeding 500*l.* per annum. Even this reform was accompanied with so great a reduction of the emoluments of the deanery, as in some cases to cripple the efficiency of the office.<sup>1</sup> In other respects, the evils that had crept in were retained and sanctioned, and many additional ones introduced.

i. The endowments of the non-resident canonries were altogether alienated from Cathedral uses.

ii. A number of residentiary canonries were suspended, and their endowments in like manner confiscated to other purposes.

iii. The residence of canons, which ought to be equal to the dean's, was everywhere reduced to the corrupt usage of three months, one only of the whole number being actually 'in residence.' This arrangement introduced for the first time the anomaly of a dean permanently resident at 1,000*l.* a-year, and twice that amount allotted to secure a single canon, or rather four revolving quarters of a canon, by his side.

iv. The canons-residentiary were still allowed to hold benefices, though only one each, in distant parts of the country; so perpetuating the practice of pluralities, with the scandal of withdrawing the pastor of a parish church from his proper duties to idle away his time at a Cathedral.

v. For no attempt was made to remove the reproach under which the Cathedrals had laboured, by attaching any more definite duties either to deans or canons.

vi. Some canonries were annexed to professorships, and some to parishes,—a measure, which, instead of helping to reform the Cathedral, operated as another form of alienating its revenues.

vii. The minor canons also were reduced in number, without in any way being rendered more efficient; on the contrary, these also were permitted to retain parochial charges, and to that extent withdraw themselves from Cathedral duty.

In all these respects the legislation of the Ecclesiastical Commission inflicted a series of heavy blows on the already enervated frames of our capitular bodies. A trifling improvement was aimed at by the enactment which provided that no person who had not been six years in priest's orders should be appointed

<sup>1</sup> The deanery of York, for instance, worth 3,000*l.* a-year, was reduced to 1,000*l.*, a sum so inadequate, that in a bill subsequently introduced, but never passed, it was attempted to raise it to 2,000*l.* A Dean of York or Wells, with a palace to keep up, on a single 1,000*l.* a-year, after the calls of his station are considered, is probably no better off than a country vicar of 300*l.* a-year.

a dean, archdeacon, or canon: and some useful limitations were placed on the exercise of the patronage left with the Chapter, which were *not* imposed on the portion which the bishops transferred to themselves. But not a single regulation was introduced to improve the Cathedral service;—not an additional sermon was provided for, though in half our Cathedrals there is only one on the Sunday;—nothing was done for the improvement of the fabrics; nothing for the management of the Chapter property; nothing, above all, for the revival of its functions as the bishop's council, or for restoring in any shape its ancient connexion with diocesan administration. On all these important points, which might certainly have been considered 'conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church,' the Ecclesiastical Commission and our episcopal legislators were as silent as if capitular action were an acknowledged impossibility, and bishops the infallible all-sufficient administrators of ecclesiastical patronage and discipline.

We submit that we have fully established our assertion, that the measures connected with this Commission were measures of Cathedral spoliation, not of Cathedral reform. The friends of these institutions complain with justice, that instead of using the opportunity to remove abuses and increase their efficiency, Parliament took away their funds, sanctioned all the practices that had brought reproach upon their name, and left them helpless and crippled, as mere pieces of royal or episcopal patronage, till another reform should consign their mutilated trunks to the flames. We have surely a right to demand from the present Commission that the poor remnant of these estates be devoted to the realization of Cathedral efficiency before and exclusive of all other objects whatsoever. Important, nay vital, as is the question of *episcopal extension* we are jealous of even this good being attempted at the expense of the Cathedrals. The large amount of property already alienated to the Ecclesiastical Commission ought to suffice as their contribution to *all* other purposes till their own requirements are fairly satisfied: and so far from expecting any surplus when this is accomplished, our fear is that sufficient revenues do not remain for the moderate supply of imperative wants.

People in general are little aware of the actual cost of Cathedral services. The fabrics alone demand an annual outlay which may startle some of our readers. York Minster has had the large sum of 106,560*l.* spent over it in the last fourteen years, including 71,590*l.* raised by public subscription on the two occasions of fire in 1829 and 1840; besides 5,000*l.* bequeathed for the restoration of the Chapter-house, and another bequest of 2,000*l.* expended on a new peal of bells.



The average annual outlay from *Cathedral funds* was nearly 2,500*l.* a-year in these fourteen years: and though the church will be thought at present one of the most perfect in the kingdom, the ordinary repairs and sustentation of the fabric are returned as still amounting to 1,031*l.* per annum, while it is estimated, that to put every part in complete repair, would require the vast outlay of 50,000*l.*! In fact, the building decays faster than it can be restored, and without a large and continual expenditure, would speedily be reduced to ruins. At Canterbury the expenditure in the same period has amounted to 31,960*l.*, or more than 2,000*l.* a-year. A complete reparation of this church was commenced in 1823, and 25,000*l.* has been borrowed from Queen Anne's Bounty to rebuild the north-western tower. The roof is now reported as much decayed, and many years will be required to complete the *necessary* reparations. Durham Cathedral is reported to be 'in very good, substantial repair,' but to have cost in the last fourteen years above 16,000*l.*—a serious sum, remembering that it has mostly been expended in spoiling the church. On Ely has more creditably been expended 28,000*l.*, and 'many parts are still much mutilated and defaced.' Wells has cost 12,951*l.*, and 'a very large sum still required to put it in proper order: the exterior is, from the action of the atmosphere, in a constant state of decomposition, and discharges from its surface heavy fragments of stone.' Lincoln has cost 21,786*l.*, and has a Fabric-fund averaging 1,604*l.* per annum. In short, it seems to be nowhere safe to assign less than 1,200*l.* or 1,500*l.* a-year to the ordinary sustentation of these ancient buildings, while some of the larger and more ornamented fabrics may require still more. The Cathedrals of the Old Foundation (Wells, we observe, is an exception) have usually a Fabric estate, and often a canon's share in the common estate besides; but the proceeds appear to be in general utterly insufficient to meet the demands. St. Paul's enjoys a special fund amounting to 1,500*l.* per annum, vested in trustees, which, in that recently-erected edifice, may be deemed sufficient. In the churches of the New Foundation the repairs are defrayed out of the common fund, and *pro tanto* diminish the dividend payable to the dean and canons. Under this arrangement their liberal outlay must be considered as redounding very greatly to the credit of the deans and chapters.

Another considerable item, which we regret not to find more particularly distinguished in the Report, is the cost of *choral services*. Besides the endowments of the minor canons, and in some churches lay vicars, the organists, songmen, and chorister boys have to be paid from the common estate; and in York, which is far from exhibiting an efficient choir, this

expense is stated at 1,113*l.* per annum. Here, then, is another charge equal to that of the fabric, before we come to the Chapter itself.<sup>1</sup> Then there is the *Library*, and the 'Expenditure for spiritual purposes,' *e.g.*, on chancels, schools, augmentations, &c. of the livings in chapter patronage. On these accounts the outlay has *not* been, in general, such as to do honour to the capitular bodies;<sup>2</sup> and there can be no proper reform unless they are specifically and suitably provided for. When all this indispensable expenditure is duly cared for, we are persuaded there will be no surplus for episcopal extension any further than that object may be subserved by the action of the Chapter itself.

We proceed, then, to the necessities of the capitular body. Here, the first object is, of course, the public worship of Almighty God. On this point we are glad to find the Commissioners speaking with no uncertain sound. They refer to the statutes both of the Old and New Cathedrals, and to the charters of King Henry VIII. to show—

'How carefully provision was made for the great purpose by the Founders and Governors of these Institutions. The members of the several Churches are dedicated for ever to the glory of Almighty God and the perpetual service of His House; *Ecclesia Cathedralis de personis congruis et singulis locis et gradibus suis perimpleatur et decoretur*: it was not a bare sufficiency, but an ample and honourable provision, that was contemplated; so that in each diocese there might be, at least, one place in which the daily Public Worship of God might be maintained in the most solemn manner, in a fabric as worthy of its holy purpose as the highest art of man could frame. In the old Cathedrals, even by the modified form of their later rules, a certain number of the whole body were enjoined to be *always* in residence; and in the new Cathedrals of King Henry VIII., the same rule was laid down by the original statutes. The peculiar manner, also, of the Divine Service is distinctly enjoined—"singulis diebus laus Dei cantu et jubilatione celebretur."—*Report*, p. xix.

Again,—

'The vast dimensions of the noble fabrics require the services of a *full* and efficient Choir.'—*Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> 'It will be found,' say the Commissioners, 'that in very few Cathedrals, if any, is the number of the choir sufficient to provide against the casualties of health; and it does not appear that any Cathedral possesses a special fund for retiring pensions.'

<sup>2</sup> The following are instances which we copy with regret. York, in the last fourteen years, *nothing* beyond individual subscriptions. S. Paul's, 584*l.* in the last ten years. Carlisle, since 1844, 178*l.* Gloucester, since 1826, 2,000*l.* Bristol, 'occasional grants;' and too many more exhibit returns equally meagre. On the other hand, there are some to be mentioned with honour. Canterbury, 5,783*l.* in the last fourteen years: Durham, 36,000*l.* in the last eleven years: Winchester, about 800*l.* per annum in augmentations, and 2,097*l.* in donations, within the last seven years: Manchester, in eight years, 2,652*l.*, contributions to Church Building: Salisbury, in ten years, 6,723*l.*, besides annual augmentations to the amount of 393*l.*: Westminster, since 1833, 27,390*l.*

It is hinted that the provisions insisted upon in the statutes of the Reformation, with regard to 'diligent preaching the Word of God,' may not be so important in an age 'when every parish is provided with a minister licensed to preach.' We conceive, however, that Cathedral sermons have still an office and a value of their own; and that at least two on the Lord's day, with others on holy days, and in the Christian seasons, ought to be carefully provided for.<sup>1</sup>

Turning to the actual state of our Cathedrals in regard to Divine service, it appears that morning and afternoon service is celebrated chorally<sup>2</sup> in *all* our Cathedrals on Sundays and holy days, and in *almost* all daily. About half the number have sermons only on the mornings of Sundays and holy days. The Holy Eucharist is celebrated every Sunday and *principal* feast days, in *twelve*; twice in the month, in *one*; and monthly, in *seventeen*. Not a single Cathedral exhibits the practice, which many parish churches have attained to, of Holy Communion *every Sunday and holy day* throughout the year. In seven of the Cathedrals only, are the early matins still observed. Durham has a Sunday evening service with a sermon in the Galilee chapel during the summer. In Winchester the usual morning and afternoon services on Sundays are multiplied into *four*—all choral. The morning service is divided in two at Salisbury and Worcester. Bangor has two Sunday services with sermons in Welsh, in addition to the English choral services; and at Landaff there is a Welsh service with sermon on Wednesday evening. With these exceptions, our Cathedral services are confined to the choir and to the old-fashioned hours, morning and afternoon, at which, on week days at least, there is in the present day the smallest chance of collecting a congregation. The Commissioners ask, with much propriety,—

'Whether a Sunday Evening Service with Sermon in the Nave, would be generally beneficial? whether the division of Services would tend to promote an increase of worshippers? and whether additional Services, not choral, might be instituted with advantage to the inhabitants of Cathedral cities.'—*Report*, p. xx.

They also 'draw attention to the fact that a great part of 'the fabrics of our Cathedrals is at present unused for public 'worship.' And again,—

'To the remarkable difference in the position occupied by the *Precentor* in the Cathedrals of the Old and of the New Foundation: in the former,

<sup>1</sup> An important suggestion is made by the Bishop of Hereford (App. p. 579), that 'A course of lectures might be delivered in the Cathedral to the candidates for Holy Orders, assembled for that purpose some time previous to their examination.'

<sup>2</sup> Llandaff is the only exception.

he is one of the principal persons, generally next in rank to the Dean; in the latter, he is one of the Minor Canons, with a very small stipend as Precentor.'—*Ibid.* p. xxi.

These suggestions and remarks point to improvements in the Cathedral services (both as to quantity and quality) which manifestly cannot be effected under the present system of residence.

Another object closely connected with the Cathedral services, is the effect that ought to be produced on the parochial churches of the city.

'One of the chief objects in any measure of improvement should be the effective spiritual care of the Cathedral cities. The daily sacrifice of prayer and praise, the holy hymns and anthems of the Cathedral choir, lose much of their value and effect, if they are not, as they were designed to be, the centre and crown of a vigorous and comprehensive church system, diffusing Christian light and joy on all around.'—*Report*, p. xxii.

Nothing could be more truly or nobly said. We need not show how completely this object has been lost sight of in our modern system. The Church is nowhere so little appreciated, Dissent nowhere so rampant,—no, not in the large neglected population of our manufacturing towns,—as in the cities which nestle under the towers of our magnificent Cathedrals, and over whose tranquil streets the clear voice of the prayer-bell is heard twice in every day. One of the greatest blots in the Ecclesiastical Commission is its strange neglect of these cities. The vicarages connected with the Cathedral *endowments*, though at a distance, are recognised as possessing a local claim on its revenues, while the Cathedral city itself has none! This extraordinary conclusion is arrived at, by keeping the eye fixed on the place whence the revenue *arises*, to the exclusion of that for whose benefit it was settled on the Cathedral. Yet, surely, *both* might have been considered as falling under the category of local claims: the city could hardly have been relegated to the same class with all other 'populous places,' had the Cathedral not ceased to be regarded as a spiritual advantage to the locality in which it is situate.

This is, therefore, another result of the low views by which the path of true reform is so frequently crossed. Their operation is in this case peculiarly unfortunate; for the Ecclesiastical Commission, after meeting local claims, deal with other poor benefices in proportion to their *population*; and as Cathedral cities are mostly subdivided into many parishes, though all are in need of augmentation, the *population taken parochially* cannot compare with the great manufacturing towns, which are often comprised in a single 'parish.' Hence, in effect, scarcely any

recompense is made to the Cathedral cities under the head of parochial augmentation, for the large revenues abstracted from their capitular establishments.

To meet this palpable defect, it has been proposed to annex some of the canonries to parochial charges in the city, a step already taken at Westminster and Manchester. It may be questioned, however, if this practice could be generally made consistent with the efficiency of the Cathedral itself. Westminster is not a Cathedral church, though the time has long arrived in which it ought to be made one, by the subdivision of the unwieldy diocese of London. Manchester is a parish church, only lately and but imperfectly turned into a Cathedral. We do not see how it is possible to have a Chapter really efficient, both for Cathedral services and diocesan administration, if its members are to be burdened with the additional and all-engrossing labours of extensive parochial cures. How, for instance, can the canons of S. Paul's be expected to satisfy the genuine requirements of their office, while the practice is continued, of filling the stalls with incumbents of parishes, which of themselves demand a college rather than a single pastor for their spiritual oversight. By such appointments the Cathedral is made a mere appendage, at best, to the parish, often only to the personal importance or family aggrandisement of the individual dignitary.

In some cities, where the parishes are not of the same overwhelming population, it is not impossible that partial annexations may be attended with good results: but we should be sorry to see this made the rule. It seems quite enough to keep the power of uniting a stall and a parish in the same person when advisable, without permanently annexing the one to the other. The distinguished success which attended the experiment made at Salisbury in the case of the present bishop, is sufficient to show how much may be achieved, even for the city, by canons permanently resident, and devoted exclusively to the proper duties of their Cathedral dignity.

A suggestion, every way more promising for the benefit of the city, is contained in the observation, that—

'By the Statutes of the Old Cathedrals, the Dean had Archidiaconal authority over the parishes of the city, and the rural parishes connected with the Cathedral; and the Archdeacons, besides their duty of general superintendence, were charged to provide for the ministrations of the Church, during the vacancy of a benefice.'—*Report*, p. xxi.

It was to assist in the exercise of this authority that the *sub-dean* was appointed; not to represent the dean in chapter or in the choir, for of the former he is not always a member,

and his duty in the latter is confined to preaching in his turn.<sup>1</sup>

No one desires the system of 'peculiar' to be revived. But to transfer the city, and in some cases, suburban districts from the jurisdiction of the archdeacon to that of the dean, would appear to us one of the best possible methods of at once sustaining and extending the Cathedral influence for good. It is just the measure required to fill up the gulf which in many places yawns so disastrously between the cathedral and the parochial clergy; breeding ostentation in the one, in the other, mortification and envy. We know no one cause to which the prevalence of dissent in Cathedral cities can be attributed with so much probability, as the contrast between the dinner-giving dignitaries and the dinner-needing incumbents. Nothing would more tend to obliterate this unchristian demarcation, than to restore the ancient connexion of the parochial clergy with the dean. At present the rectors and vicars of a Cathedral city, each absolute and neglected in his own little sphere, *totus teres atque rotundus*, may be compared to a bag of marbles emptied on a mahogany table, every one running his course with a supreme indifference towards the rest. And if occasionally collected at some rare and formal banquet in the episcopal palace, they are only the same marbles *put into the bag*. We do not ourselves know a single instance of the bishop exercising that amalgamating influence among the city clergy which might be expected by the uninitiated; and if there are any, the union is in all probability wholly extraneous, perhaps antagonistic, to the *Cathedral*. In general we fear the supervision of the clergy, both episcopal and archidiaconal, is much laxer at the seat of the see than in any other part of the diocese.

It would be every way, then, a most beneficial reform, to restore the ancient decanal jurisdiction. The bishop would gain another 'eye' in the important but neglected centre of his authority; and if only the right men were selected for deaneries, the city clergy would obtain a real friend, adviser and leader, round whom they would quickly gather, and make his Cathedral again the centre and model of their parochial worship.

The remarks already offered go a long way to prove the necessity and advantage of a really resident capitular body. It is further to be remembered, that a variety of other necessary duties cluster round the great centre of Cathedral worship, and put in their several demands on its establishments. The chapter *libraries*, anciently a great portion of the chan-

<sup>1</sup> 'Sub-decani officium est, si decanus abfuerit ecclesie vices ejus supplere, curam archidiaconatus in urbe et suburbis gerere.'—*Salisbury Statutes*.



cellor's charge, obviously need some better superintendence and management than at present exist, to render the treasures they contain as accessible as they might be made, to the city and diocese at large. The department of *education*, again, whether theological, classical, or elementary, should in all reason and principle, be preserved and developed in every Cathedral establishment; and whatever be the subordinate arrangements, a principal residentiary member, at the least, is required for its superintendence.

Then there is the Fabric itself, each with its particular style of architecture, and all with their glorious array of pillar and arch, and storied windows, and cunning carving of wood and stone, demanding, even for the ordinary repairs, the continual attention of a mind imbued with the principles of their construction, and furnished with some knowledge of the practical appliances required for their sustentation. How is it possible that all these various duties should be adequately cared for by a single residentiary canon, selected for no special aptitude for any one of them, and whirling quickly round in the kaleidoscope of a rotatory residence? The framers of our Cathedral establishments, we have seen, provided a resident dignitary, assisted by a staff of canons, for *each* of these departments. Such were the *quatuor personæ*. 1. The *dean* presiding over the whole establishment, with the spiritual cure of its members, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction throughout the city. 2. The *precentor*, directing the choir with the whole department of Cathedral worship. 3. The *chancellor*, having special charge (along with the corporate seal) of the theological, literary, and educational departments: and 4. The *treasurer*, entrusted with the fabric and sacred utensils, and administering what may be termed the department of *ecclesiastical architecture and art*. With *less* than these four dignitaries, or their equivalents, *permanently* resident, it is impossible to carry out the idea of a Cathedral at all. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, however, with their customary misapprehension of Cathedral requisites, have swept away the endowments of precentor, chancellor, and treasurer altogether; and a proposition is now broached to abolish the dean, and transfer his duties to the bishop. We are surprised that the Cathedral Commissioners should have entertained this suggestion, even so far as to refer it for the consideration of the several bishops. The Bishop of Lichfield disposes of it with this brief common-sense observation:—

'I am not aware of any advantage likely to result from "uniting the offices of Bishop and Dean." I am sure the Bishops, at least generally, have enough to do in their proper sphere, without having the burden of another office laid upon them.'—*Appendix*, p. 582.

The Bishop of Exeter more elaborately meets it in this way:—

‘If it be meant to destroy the corporate character of the Chapter, and to substitute a *collegium presbyterorum cui præsit episcopus*, it would be simply a return to primitive practice, on the adaptation of which to the existing state of things in our own Church, I would crave permission to decline at present offering an opinion. I am very far from wishing to imply any condemnation of such a proposal. I only presume to suggest that it involves considerations too many and too grave to be dealt with in a cursory paper like this. On the other hand, if it be intended to make the Bishop the head of the capitular corporation, the proposal would seem to me to be open to very serious objections; one only of which it may be deemed sufficient to mention,—namely, that the effect of such a measure would manifestly be to heap another class of onerous duties and occupations on the already overlaid shoulders of the Bishop.’—*Appendix*, p. 572.

It must be obvious indeed, as the Bishop of Llandaff observes:—‘That the union of the two offices would be impossible,’ if the residence and other functions of the dean are to be retained on the footing already admitted to be essential to Cathedral efficiency. We may, therefore, dismiss this suggestion as one of revolution rather than reform.<sup>1</sup>

The time is now come when the Church and the country must decide once for all, whether they choose to retain their Cathedrals or not. If we make up our minds to sacrifice these precious legacies to considerations of economy, or the demands of other portions of the Church’s system, we had better be consistent and suppress the Chapters altogether. It would be preferable to pull down the edifices, rather than shame their magnificent proportions, and expose our own hollowness, by keeping up a melancholy, mutilated, fragment of establishments, that once had a meaning and a place in the service of God. A scanty, scrambling band of choristers and songmen, dotting rather than occupying the spacious choir, and with ill-sustained efforts startling, not wakening, the echoes of the majestic pile,—a single minor canon, drearily plodding through matins, and lessons, and litany,—a long row of empty stalls, finished off at the curtailed extremity by a solitary dignitary trying to present the majesty of an absent Chapter in the pomp of his personal bearing, or acting the precentor by beating time to the anthem,—these are really not worth preserving at any price. Better give up a struggle that neither honours God nor benefits mankind, and subside into a form of worship which we can more honestly

<sup>1</sup> The proposal is countenanced by the Bishops of Ripon, S. David’s, and Manchester; but the first refers only to his own Cathedral, which is a parish church, and suffering under a *plethora* of newly-erected, and little-valued Cathedral dignitaries. The second leans to the idea of a *suffragan* bishop as dean; and the last is hardly an authority on this, or any other, point. Perhaps the Dean of Manchester might be equally sceptical on the value of the bishop!

appreciate. If, on the other hand, these homes of ancient piety are still to be upheld, let them be rendered in some degree worthy of their purpose, and of Him to whose service they are consecrated. Let the Church of England be no longer saddled with the reproach of not understanding the distinguishing features of her own polity. We ask for no 'meretricious display,' no decorative arts, no intricate music, no unusual gestures, ceremonies, or processions; we only want the English worship solemnized in harmony with its own standard, and our Cathedral establishments made what they profess to be.

We will proceed to indicate some of the details in which we conceive this object may yet, to a great extent, be accomplished.

The primary consideration is the *constitution of the residentiary body*; for a *body* is clearly indispensable; and here we would begin (as already suggested) by recalling the *quatuor personæ* into *joint and continuous residence*. If no other residentiaries were added, a precentor, chancellor, and treasurer, permanently administering their respective departments, would be a very happy exchange for the four partially residentiary canons, who constitute the present establishment. But in the larger Cathedrals, at least three canons should be in continuous residence along with the dignitaries, making seven in all. Crippled as we now are for pecuniary means, it might not be necessary to insist on this establishment in the smaller churches, where the *quatuor personæ*, together with the minor canons, might probably suffice. It is essential, however, that in the metropolitan churches of Canterbury and York, in S. Paul's, Westminster Abbey, Durham, Ely, Manchester, and wherever else the funds are still available, the establishments should be placed on a scale which we need not blush to exhibit to the foreigners who now visit us from so many parts of the world. Considering the limited musical capacities of our nation, it might be wiser to select some seven or eight of the largest Cathedrals for the more complete constitution, and let the others be content with a secondary, though consistent and effective, scale of establishments.

Whether any of the residentiary body should be permitted to hold a benefice *in the city*, would depend entirely on local circumstances. One of the greatest mistakes of our Cathedral reformers hitherto, has been to impose a Procrustean standard on churches and cities of widely different dimensions. We regard the Four we have named as the minimum requisite in *every* see, in order to realize the true idea of a Cathedral church; but we would leave other points to be determined by local requisites, and personal qualifications. It might be left open, then, so far as legislation is concerned, to the precentor, chancellor, and treasurer, as it is at present to the dean, to hold a benefice *in the Cathedral city*;

and the whole Chapter, together with the visitor, might determine in each particular instance, whether such an arrangement be desirable; in other words, the dignitary should be required to obtain the consent of the bishop and the Chapter before institution to a benefice.

Having thus settled the residentiary body, all the other canons might be placed in the position belonging of ancient right to the non-resident members of the Old Foundations; that is, all should be members of the Chapter, with the right of officiating in the services of the Cathedral as often as they find opportunity, and *bound* also, as at present, to take their turns in the preaching. We should further propose, that while the residentiaries might hold intermediate Chapters (with due notice) for the transaction of pressing affairs, all the ordinary business, *including the exercise of patronage*, the management of the property, and the regulations for Divine service, should be transacted only at *Quarterly* Chapters, which the non-resident canons should be bound to attend, unless prevented by illness, or other cause to be approved by the dean. By this means the Cathedral would enjoy the counsel of all its members, and be enabled to assemble them on every occasion of more than ordinary solemnity. Some of these canons might be accidentally, though not necessarily, resident in the Cathedral city, as parochial clergymen or otherwise. The archdeacons of the diocese should always be among their number; so might diocesan inspectors and rural deans, at the discretion of the bishop, and according to the materials at his disposal. The number of such stalls, therefore, should be considerable, though not of necessity uniform in every church. In the Cathedrals of the Old Foundation, the existing number might remain. In those of the New, the 'honorary canons,' who have now no proper Cathedral function, should be taken into the Chapter on the same footing with the non-resident members in the others. The chief difficulty, with regard to such members of Chapters, is the *financial one*. We agree with the Bishop of Hereford in the importance of restoring—

'The Prebendaries (or Honorary Canons as they now are, even where the name of Prebendary is still preserved, as at Hereford,') to some portion at least of that interest which they formerly possessed in the Cathedral funds, and of which recent legislation has deprived them.'—*Appendix*, p. 579.

<sup>1</sup> As some confusion seems to exist with regard to these names, it may be well to remind the reader, that 'honorary canons,' properly speaking, exist only in the Cathedrals of the *New* Foundation; where they were established by the 3 and 4 Vic. c. 113. In the old Cathedrals the non-resident stalls are retained without emoluments, and so far are 'honorary,' but the Act reserves to them all the other rights and privileges of their predecessors. Such members were no doubt originally all

It is certainly unjust to require clergymen to travel to the Cathedral in order to preach, and *à fortiori* to attend the Chapter, without at least reimbursing their expenses. Bishop Hampden proposes a payment out of the common fund, as in the case of the University preachers at Oxford. A better mode might be a small endowment to each stall, subject to a fine for every occasion of non-attendance. There is no reason why after securing to each stall some moderate endowment, just enough to recognise the position and defray its necessary expenditure, *stipends* should not be paid out of the common fund to particular canons, varying with the offices they might hold (if any) in connexion with the Chapter, such as theological professors, school inspectors, or in some cases, rural deans. This is matter of detail, and must be regulated by the amount of money disposable for the purpose. The archdeacons have already an official endowment, unconnected with residence at the Cathedral; and if the decanal jurisdiction were restored over the city, the argument for their being called into residence would be done away.

Let us now recapitulate the constitution, which a perusal of the mass of information and suggestions contained in the Report and Appendix, together with some personal acquaintance with the details both of Cathedral and parochial work, have led us to suggest as best adapted to present exigencies and the amount of funds still available.

i. The Dean, presiding over the whole Cathedral Establishment and Chapter, with archidiaconal jurisdiction in the city.

ii. The Precentor, charged with the details of the choir, the whole celebration of Cathedral worship, and the religious, moral, and musical training of the chorister boys.

iii. The Chancellor, charged with the departments of theology, literature, and education; including special lectures in the Cathedral pulpit, the care of the library, and the superintendence of the grammar-school. This dignitary might, in some places, be the principal of a theological college.

iv. The Treasurer, specially superintending the architectural and artistic repairs and restoration of the fabric.

---

*canons*; but as that word denotes a *Member of Chapter*, it came in time to be applied to the residentiaries only, while the others were distinguished by the appellation of Prebendaries, *i. e.* persons enjoying a *præbenda* in the Church. In the official documents both terms are employed, and strictly speaking, the dignitary is a canon of the Cathedral and prebendary of the particular stall; but when the seat in chapter had been lost, Prebendary became the most usual designation. At York, where the place in Chapter was retained, they were called indifferently by either appellation, but now, since the *præbenda* has been lost, the title of *Canon*, we observe, is usually and most properly borne.

The above to be permanently resident, (*i. e.* for nine months yearly,) and to be disqualified from holding any other preferment save within the Cathedral city, and then only by consent of the bishop and chapter.

v. The Archdeacons of the diocese.

vi. The Canons, according to the present number of stalls (non-resident or honorary), in each Cathedral.

The archdeacons and canons not to be obliged to residence, but to preach in their turns, and to attend the Quarterly Chapters, for the despatch of business, and the exercise of patronage. Endowments to be provided sufficient to cover the necessary expenses thus entailed, and so secure a full attendance. In the larger churches, where three of the canons are to be called into permanent residence, provision must also be made accordingly.

We have now to estimate the means available for the support of such Chapters. By the provisions of the recent Acts of Parliament, all the *separate* estates belonging to the several dignities and stalls in the Cathedrals of the Old Foundation are alienated to the Ecclesiastical Commission, subject to a fixed provision of 1000*l.* per annum for the dean, and 2,000*l.* at S. Paul's. There remains, therefore, only the *common* estate of the Cathedrals to supply the Chapters. Moreover, the surplus of all common estates is already sentenced to a similar doom, after furnishing stipends on the following scale.

Dean of Durham . . . . .	£3,000
Dean of Westminster . . . . .	2,000
Dean of Manchester . . . . .	1,500
Other deans of New Foundation . . . . .	1,000
Or in some cases between . . . . .	1,000 and £2,000
Canons of Durham, S. Paul's, and Westminster . . . . .	1,000
Canons of Manchester . . . . .	600
Other Canons (residentiary) . . . . .	500
Or in some cases from . . . . .	500 to £1,000
Deans in Wales . . . . .	700
Canons in Wales . . . . .	350

As the deans were required by these enactments to reside permanently at their Cathedrals, it may be presumed that the above provision was deemed sufficient for their honourable maintenance. We certainly desire, however, to see the deaneries of the Metropolitan churches of Canterbury and York restored, at least, to a par with their youngest sister, Manchester. The magnitude of the city of York, and the permanent absence of the archbishop from Canterbury, are additional and all-sufficient reasons for this augmentation; or, to speak more properly, for retaining so much of their own endowments to their proper use. The canons were not intended to be resident all the year, and



the sum of 500*l.* would, in most Cathedral cities, be quite insufficient to support their position: but if, instead of the present wasteful, as well as otherwise faulty system, we exchange the four quarter-residentiaries for three *whole* dignitaries, precentor, chancellor, and treasurer, there would be 2,000*l.* per annum, at the least, for their endowment.

But the common estates are known to yield a much larger revenue;<sup>1</sup> and there can be no difficulty in providing from this quarter endowments of from 600*l.* to 900*l.* per annum for the dignities we have named, as well as proportionate incomes for the residentiary canons proposed in the larger churches, and the smaller payments to non-resident members. Only let the principle of Cathedral efficiency be honestly recognised, and all the requirements we suggest can be met without recalling any of the funds already appropriated to parochial purposes by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

On this part of the subject the Report before us refers to two rather extraordinary transactions.

'The Chapters of York and Carlisle have recently transferred the *whole* of their corporate property to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, receiving in exchange an annual payment, equal to the amount of their average incomes and ordinary expenditure, until such time as the Commissioners shall convey to the Chapters landed property sufficient to produce an equivalent revenue. We have not been able as yet to obtain sufficient information on the reasons which led to these entire transfers of the capitular property. We are anxious that this subject should be fully investigated, because by these transactions the Chapters, while they secure a more steady average revenue, appear to divest themselves of some very important capitular functions, recognised by the statutes, and having a direct bearing upon their position and influence in the diocese.'—*Report*, p. xlix.

We cannot say we like the manner of this rebuke. It seems to 'hint a fault and hesitate dislike,' instead of boldly announcing the principle, and affixing the proper measure of reproof. Why did not the Commissioners themselves proceed in the investigation they so vaguely suggest to others? What should hinder their obtaining any information they might need? How came those members of their body, who are also Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to be implicated in such suspicious bargains? And, above all, how can the Archbishop of York, whose signature is attached to this censure, reconcile it with his duty as *visitor*, to *allow* his Chapter thus to divest themselves of 'important capitular functions, recognised by the statutes?' There is use, and there may be much injustice, in trying to fasten upon individuals a fault which they share in common with their superiors and the Legislature itself. The Chapters of York and Carlisle have simply carried out the views pro-

<sup>1</sup> In York, for example, 4,410*l.* per annum.—See *Appendix*, p. 28.

pounded by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, acquiesced in by the episcopal bench, and sanctioned by Parliament. They have accepted, as a *fait accompli*, the disgraceful mutilation of Cathedral institutions effected by superior authority, and tried to patch up the remnants for their own advantage. Finding both the property and the trusts, 'recognised by their statutes,' forcibly interfered with, and the remnants spared only as 'prizes' for the benefits of the individual residentiaries, they have turned them to the best account, by making over their encumbered estates to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in return for an arrangement more beneficial to themselves and their successors. Several of the bishops have done the same, and in each case the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, including the whole episcopal bench, have been the other party to the bargain. In all such transfers of property, both bishops and Chapters shift from their own shoulders and those of their successors many most 'important functions,' originally annexed to their endowments. But when these functions have been long neglected by common consent, and Church reformers, instead of seeking to revive them, set up the Ecclesiastical Commission to complete their legal extinction, why are these two Chapters to be blamed for not being wiser or more virtuous than the rest of their generation?

In a higher point of view these transactions are in every case ruinous and indefensible. If the Cathedral Commissioners would assume the office of exposing and reforming them with an impartial hand, we should be the last to deprecate their censures, however weighty.

On turning to the account given by the Chapter of York in the Appendix, we find it stated that the sum for which their common estate has been thus 'commuted' is 4,410*l.* per annum, and that the property made over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in return is '*probably three-fold*' the value. So that here we have a corporate body, in order to 'secure a more steady average revenue,' *sacrificing two-thirds of the trust estate*, to the pecuniary advantage of the trustees! But this is not all. The Chapter proceeds, with a candour perfectly suicidal, to represent,—

'That the alienation of so great a mass of property, lying chiefly in the county of York, and connected with a great number of poor livings now left without claims on the bounty of the members of the capitular body, appears to form a just ground of expectation that *special consideration* should be paid by those who now hold the property to the wants of the cures immediately connected therewith.'—Appendix, p. 28.

Now this is too bad. In answer to the question, 'What is the amount of aid afforded by the Chapter from its corporate reve-

'nues for spiritual objects in the diocese, or in parishes connected 'with the capitular body, or for religious purposes generally?' the Chapter of York reply, 'Members of Chapter have individually contributed as they thought proper to these purposes.' That is to say, they have done as all other clergymen and Christians do—bestowed their individual and personal bounty 'as they thought proper;' but *nothing* has been given out of the corporate revenue;—*nothing* to meet the claim of right, which they wish to establish against the Commissioners who now hold the property. The Dean and Chapter of Durham answer the same question by exhibiting a schedule of augmentations, occupying two folio pages, and amounting in fee to nearly 150,000*l.* At York it is thought enough for individuals to contribute 'as they think proper,' and as a matter of personal '*bounty*.' We have not yet, however, reached the worst. The Dean and Chapter proceed to argue that these lands and livings involve a solemn trust. 'A bar,' they say, 'ought to be put to the '*diversion of any funds anciently and legally appropriated to 'maintaining' the fabrics and services of the several parishes. Yet they have themselves voluntarily, and for their own pecuniary advantage, 'diverted' this whole property to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners! They insist, again, on the right of their fabric to retain its sixth share in the future improvement of this estate, as it would, unquestionably, have done had it remained with themselves. These are their words:—*

'The Dean and Chapter of York *endeavoured* to insist that the trust funds here referred to should be as scrupulously respected by those into whose hands it has passed, as it would have been by the Court of Chancery; but the commutation, as above described, of their common estates, WHICH INCLUDE THE TRUST FUND, *has taken place without a guarantee on this point!*'—*Appendix*, p. 28.

Taken place, indeed! By what means? By the voluntary act of the Chapter, who, finding that the Commissioners would not, or could not, give the guarantee they asked for, handed over their estate (*trust fund included*) without it, being solely intent on the advantage or convenience to *themselves* of 'a more steady average income.' And then they come with an appeal to the Cathedral Commissioners, 'to show the importance of rigorously 'retaining such funds in a just application to their original 'purposes!'

We are as anxious as the Cathedral Commissioners can be to have all such matters thoroughly investigated; but they indicate no channel for conducting the inquiry which they have declined for themselves, and we can only hope that Parliament will interpose to cancel these transactions, or if it be too late for that, to prevent any more such 'commutations.'

We have now endeavoured to trace the leading features, and to show the feasibility of a genuine measure of Cathedral reform. We have laid down distinctly, we hope, but of course only in general terms, some outlines of what a Cathedral establishment may yet be made. To fill in the sketch with the several important functions it might discharge, both in the city and the diocese, is more than can be attempted in a single review.

But our task would be too imperfectly executed, if we did not offer some remarks on the mode of selecting the individuals to be entrusted with capitular duties. This has hitherto been treated as a matter of mere *patronage*; exercised in most Cathedrals by the bishop of the diocese, in some few by the Crown or the Lord Chancellor, and in others by the majority of the Chapter. At York the appointment of the *canons* was with the Archbishop; while the Dean, as we have seen, had obtained the privilege of nominating out of their number the four who were to be joined with himself as *residentiaries*. The recent legislation abrogates all these privileges on the part of deans and chapters, and vests the patronage in all cases, saving the rights of the Crown, in the bishop of the diocese. It is now suggested that the Crown and the Lord Chancellor, instead of appointing to all the stalls in particular Cathedrals, should present to one or two in several churches, and let the diocesan fill the remainder. This suggestion obviously and naturally proceeds from the bishops whose Cathedrals are at present *wholly* in State patronage, and it would doubtless be well to adopt it; but there can be no greater mistake than to suppose that any real improvement will ensue from a mere change of patrons, unaccompanied by new guarantees for the right exercise of the trust. Regarded simply as patrons, we know no reason for preferring bishops to deans and chapters, or ecclesiastics to laymen. Either class are perfectly competent to make fit appointments if they choose; and we fear that all have pretty equally exhibited their liability to be influenced otherwise through nepotism, private favour, or political interest. In theory, perhaps, the system still obtaining at York is as good as any, and certainly is not likely to be improved by centring the patronage absolutely in the archbishop. Again, the clergy certainly have little reason for wishing to abolish the patronage of the Crown; since Premiers and Chancellors are not all to be measured by the standards of Lord John Russell and Lord Cranworth; and by vesting some appointments in Ministers of State, a door is opened to many good men, who have not the fortune to occupy the first place in the episcopal favour. The main thing is to induce patrons, whoever they may be, to select

the right men, or at all events to restrain them from selecting those who are notoriously the wrong men, for Cathedral preferment.

The course of late pursued with this object in view has been to reduce the emoluments below the acceptance of the *very* influential class, and we are far from denying that some advantage may have attended this ingenious device. In the affairs of the world it is considered the best policy, when work is required to be well done, to pay for it accordingly. In the Church it has been found, that duty is more carefully attended to in proportion as its just remuneration is withdrawn.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the residentiary body is not *all* that is required for the service of the Cathedral. We can hardly expect, that even with three canons in addition to the dignitaries, the aid of *vicars choral* can be dispensed with; while in the Cathedrals of the second class, where none but the dignitaries would be left in residence, this lower order must supply assistance of a more general kind. It would be necessary, therefore, to retain perhaps *three* minor canons in every Cathedral, who must have residences and suitable incomes provided from their own, or the superior, foundation, so as to be under no necessity of eking out a subsistence by parochial or scholastic labours. Their time must be devoted exclusively to the Cathedral; and genuine skill, both in the science and practice of chanting, with superior voices, should be strictly insisted upon. For these requirements, a less remuneration than 250*l.* per annum cannot well be offered.

The *lay* members of the Foundation also are to be considered. These are almost everywhere reduced below the number essential to the efficiency of a choral service, besides being often wretchedly paid, and, as the necessary consequence, miserably qualified for their important function. At Durham, the lay-vicars are ten in number, and share 1,147*l.* amongst them. At York, they have fourteen songmen, but only *six* bound to *daily* attendance, and these *six* have but 45*l.* a-year each. Both of these Cathedrals have ten choristers, six of whom at York get but 8*l.* a-year, and the others 12*l.* and 14*l.*; while at Durham all under twelve years of age receive 17*l.* a-year, and the older boys 27*l.* A first-class Cathedral ought to have *twelve* men and sixteen or twenty boys, at the Durham rate of allowance; and about 200*l.* per annum should be set aside as a *superannuation* fund. Cathedrals of the second class might be content with half this establishment; and both classes might be able, when their establishments were settled on a respectable and remunerative scale, to increase their force by the employment of unpaid *probationers*. The idea of relying on

voluntary assistance further than this, is considered by almost all the precentors and organists perfectly visionary.

The daily service, the schools, the fabric, and other objects more immediately connected with the Cathedral locality, being thus attended to, it remains to consider the capitular body in its *corporate* character, and more particularly in its relations to the bishop and the diocese.

Supposing then a Chapter thus constituted of a residentiary body, duly qualified for Cathedral duties, and exclusively devoted to their performance, with a number of non-residentiary canons variously occupied in the diocese, and all assembled together at quarterly meetings, we might hope to restore with some effect its ancient character as the council of the Bishop in the administration of the diocese. *Legislative* acts demand the authority of a diocesan or provincial synod; but it is the *executive*, more than the legislative, function that needs to be organized and strengthened among ourselves. To this end the capitular council might prove an organ of inestimable advantage. The non-resident canons would often comprehend the majority of the rural deans, or the latter might be associated with the Chapter at its conciliary meetings. Though the Cathedral would require its Quarterly Chapters, it might suffice to hold the council *half-yearly*. On these occasions the bishop should always preside in person; and the rural deans should invariably assemble their local Chapters a month before, so as to enable any question that may arise among the clergy to be referred for the consideration of the capitular council. Such an organization, reaching direct from the centre to every part of the diocese, would at once infuse a new life into all its members. By thus simply putting 'into gear' the existing machinery of the Church, we should again unite the bishop, the Cathedral chapter, and the parochial clergy in one harmonious whole; and we must defy the experience of all mankind, in all affairs, to suppose that such a concentration of purpose would not be attended with the most beneficial and practical results.

Certain it is that relations such as these formed a prominent feature in the original constitution of our Cathedral institutions, and were foremost among the objects contemplated in their retention at the Reformation. The Report we are reviewing furnishes some valuable extracts to this effect from the writings both of ancient and modern canonists—of foreign as well as English divines. Thus Binterim, in his *Christ Katholische Kirche*,—

'During the lifetime, and still more on the death of the bishop, the Cathedral chapter must take a part in the administration of affairs in the diocese. The most important concerns (according to the rules of the canon



law) shall not be undertaken by the bishop without consultation with the Chapter. The whole Chapter has, consequently, relations with the diocese. From this Chapter certain members must be chosen to examine the clerks applying for ordination, and the priests as to their care for the souls under their charge. Others must have different offices, which may have an influence either on the clergy or laity of the diocese. Every member shall, by virtue of his office, be to the diocese as a shining light and a strengthening salt.—*Report*, p. lv.

Our own bishop Scambler (of Peterborough and Norwich), who himself had been prebendary both of York and Westminster, writes to Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1582:—

‘That kind of foundation implieth alway a society of learned men, staied and grounded in all parts of religion, apt to preach the Gospel and convince errors and heresies, which in the singleness of opinion, where particular men over particular churches as pastors are set within the diocese where it is chief, may happen to arise: and further, to assist the bishop, the head of the diocese, in all godly and wholesome consultations, inasmuch that the Cathedral church ought to be, as it were, the oracle of the whole diocese, and a light unto all places lying near it.—*Ibid.*

Bishop Stillingfleet, again, (in his ‘Ecclesiastical Cases,’ vol. ii. p. 564—8) asserts the same, both from the history of our Church and ‘that which is far more material, our common law; it is said that the dean and chapter were appointed as a council to the bishop, with whom he is to consult in cases of difficulty.’ And Lord Bacon reckons, ‘the sole exercise of authority, one of the two circumstances in the administration of bishops wherein he could never be satisfied.’ ‘The greatest kings and monarchs,’ (he says) ‘have their councils. There is no temporal court in England where the authority rests in one person. Surely, one may suppose, that from the beginning it was not thus, and that the deans and chapters were councils about the sees and chairs of bishops at the first, and were to them a presbytery or consistory, and intermeddled, not only in the disposing of their revenues and endowments, but much more in ecclesiastical jurisdiction.’—P. lvii.

When statements of this kind are submitted to Her Most Gracious Majesty under the hands and seals of the two archbishop., the dean of the arches, and a vice-chancellor, we may hope that we have outlived that unreasoning jealousy of synodical action, which, natural as it was in the Hanoverian prelates, who knew themselves to be odious to the bulk of the clergy and the Church, is now the most cruel injustice a bishop can perpetrate against himself and his diocese. No prelacy in the world (save, *perhaps*, the pope’s) has become so autocratical as the English episcopate; consequently, no office in Church or

<sup>1</sup> The signatures to the Report are:—J. B. CANTUAR., T. EDOR., BLANDFORD, HARROWBY, C. J. LONDON, S. OXON., H. MONTAGU VILLIERS, J. DODSON, J. PATTERSON, WILLIAM PAGE WOOD, CHR. WORDSWORTH, W. F. HOOK, and WILLIAM SELWYK.

State is more exposed to the perils of *isolation*, which—at all times the Nemesis of arbitrary power—is to a *Church* the angel of death. It is through having been involved in the cold shadow of this terrible cloud, that our Cathedrals have suffered, and still suffer, both from without and within. To be safe themselves, they must vindicate their rightful share in the general sympathies;—they must insist on discharging their proper function in the circulation of the living tide that animates the Church's heart. And if in the honourable struggle for a redintegration of their relations with the Church and the diocese, they draw back the bishops with them, rendering them, in spite of their fears, the centres of a mighty but well-ordered action, they will return good for evil, and prove the deep practical wisdom of those who planted the English episcopate on a Cathedral platform.

We have now only to express our hope, that the Cathedral Commissioners will not be diverted from the great and practical objects of capitular endowments by any pedantic or *amateur* propositions. To accomplish a great practical reform, they must consider present feelings, wants, and habits, in conjunction with ancient immoveable principles. Any attempt to reduce Cathedral dignitaries to 'primitive poverty,'—to saddle them with conflicting duties,—or to require a mode of life which is foreign to the national habits of English society, would only serve to increase their *isolation*, and so precipitate their suppression. We believe that a sound thorough reform is now feasible, if the recommendations we are awaiting shall be found simple, bold, and consistent. But if the Commissioners should unhappily resort to petty half-measures, or lose themselves in speculative eccentric innovations, their labours will be thrown away, and reformers of another spirit will quickly assume the lead. We comfort ourselves with the hope, that the former of these courses will be adopted, and, for which object, the Commissioners desire the prayers of Her Majesty and the whole Church, that they may be enabled to suggest a noble scheme, which 'may tend to make our Cathedral churches once more, *as they were* 'originally, integral and effective parts of our ecclesiastical organization, fitted to promote to the utmost the public worship of 'ALMIGHTY GOD, and to maintain and extend that holy faith of 'CHRIST our Saviour, which by their means was first propagated 'and established in this country.'

Since the foregoing pages were in type, we have perused the publication by the Bishop of Salisbury, the title of which is prefixed to this article. Perhaps there is no individual now living better qualified than his Lordship to suggest a sound

practical measure of Cathedral Reform, and it is much to be regretted he was not included in the Capitular Commission. We are strongly confirmed in the views arrived at from our acquaintance with Cathedrals, in many respects differently circumstanced from that of Salisbury, to find so great an authority substantially agreed with ourselves. The Bishop states the two great principles on which the work of a Cathedral system depends, to be

*'The constant residence of the dean and canons, and the discharge of their proper functions by the members of the large Chapter.'*—P. 5.

Like us he would restore that distribution of definite duties among the residentiary body which the founders had in view in the establishment of the *quatuor personæ*, while he suggests a variety of modern duties which might (in his own city) be similarly assigned in addition:—such as the head-mastership of the Grammar-school to the chancellor; the secretaryship of the Board of Education and the chaplaincy to the Training-school, to the treasurer; the parochial charge of a district to be annexed to the Cathedral, to the precentor; and a vicarage in the city, to a residentiary canon. These are matters of detail to be settled by the Deans and Chapters themselves with the approval of the bishop. All that legislation can accomplish is the right constitution of the corporate body, with the powers and restrictions requisite to its efficiency.

The Bishop of Salisbury thinks that in his Cathedral the establishment might consist of *one* residentiary canon in addition to the four dignitaries, and *four* vicars-choral always resident; one of whom should act as curate of the Cathedral district under the precentor, another as lecturer at the Grammar and Training-schools, a third, as chaplain to the city workhouse, and secretary of the elementary and Infant-schools, and the fourth as librarian. The vicars, he thinks, should not form, as at present, a distinct corporation, but surrender their property and receive fixed incomes regularly paid by the Dean and Chapter. Of lay-vicars he recommends twelve in place of six, and sixteen choristers instead of eight; the former with respectable stipends, the latter, as at present, *boarded, educated, and apprenticed* by the Chapter.

These suggestions, with a number of other details, having been embodied in a regular plan, were *unanimously* approved by the Dean and Chapter of Salisbury, and submitted, with the full concurrence of the late Bishop Denison, to the Cathedral Commissioners. If any doubt could exist of the great advantages to be derived to the Church at large from the adoption of

such a reform, it must be dispelled by a simple perusal of the Bishop's List of 'principles attempted to be realized.'

- '1. The furtherance of education in all its branches.
- '2. The worthy celebration of Divine Worship.
- '3. The constant residence of the Dean and Canons at their Cathedral.
- '4. Justice to those vicarages of which the Dean and Chapter are Rectors.
- '5. Liberal contributions to charities in those parishes where the Dean and Chapter have any property.
- '6. The proper endowment of parochial cures in Cathedral cities.
- '7. The payment of proper stipends to all persons connected with the Cathedrals, and so the abolition of the system of fees.
- '8. The restoration of the dignitaries and prebendaries to their legitimate functions.
- '9. The connexion of districts with Cathedrals.
- '10. The greater frequency of more varied and popular services.
- '11. The revival of discipline in the Cathedral body, by removing the trammels which fetter both the relation of the visitor to the Dean and Chapter, and all the other relations of authority statutely and necessarily existing in such a society.'—P. 4.

In this list—indeed in the whole scheme suggested in the pamphlet—there is one important omission. No reference whatever is made to the functions of the Chapter *as council to the Bishop*. His Lordship states with great force the importance of preserving the non-residentiary canons to supply the requisite connexion between the residentiary body and the diocese at large. He proposes to summon this large Chapter annually at Pentecost (according to a former custom at Salisbury) to audit the Cathedral accounts, and hear appeals on all matters connected with the Chapter, its officers and schools; but he is unaccountably silent with respect to any duties of a conciliatory character. On this point, therefore, we must decidedly prefer the more extended action suggested in our previous remarks.

It is satisfactory to find that no question is made in this pamphlet, that all the important objects in view may be achieved by an improved management of the property still remaining in the Cathedral corporations. The suggestions of Bishop Denison, concurred in by his successor, is that these estates should be transferred *for a time* to a central Commission constituted for this express purpose. By such an arrangement all the advantage would be derived which the Chapters of York and Carlisle proposed to secure in their recent commutation with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, while the improved value of the property, when disencumbered of its leases, would be reserved to accomplish the noble reforms we have endeavoured to indicate, instead of being melted down in the voracious crucible of that very unsatisfactory Commission.

ART. IV.—1. *An Inquiry into the Principles of Church-authority; or, Reasons for recalling my Subscription to the Royal Supremacy.* By R. I. WILBERFORCE, M.A. London: Longmans. 1854. Pp. 284.

2. *Papal Supremacy tested by Antiquity.* By the late Rev. JAMES MEYRICK, M.A. London: Longmans. 1855. Pp. 84.

THESE two books were being written, it appears, by their respective authors about the same time. They go over the same ground, so far as the main subject in hand is concerned, and arrive at very different conclusions. We have placed them together at the head of our article, because we shall have to contrast the statements made by the two writers on several points. But our present work is with Mr. Wilberforce.

There is nothing new in the 'Inquiry' before us except its name. We doubt if there is a single fact or a single thought contained in its pages which has not previously appeared in one or the other of Mr. Allies' two works on the same subject. Indeed the whole book may be said to be an expansion of the Preface to Mr. Allies' 'See of St. Peter.' At the same time, though Mr. Wilberforce has brought forward no new facts, and has discovered no new principle to give an altered complexion to facts previously known, his present book is by no means deficient in merits of its own. It is excellently arranged. A theory is put forward, and facts are marshalled in such a way as to fit in with the theory as well as is possible. Whether this has been done fairly or unfairly, whether counterbalancing facts have been duly noticed or omitted, whether the facts which are selected have been stated with all their qualifying circumstances, or whether they have been so strung together as to lead a reader to draw a conclusion from them different from that which in themselves they would naturally suggest, are points which we propose presently to consider.

Besides the merit of arrangement, Mr. Wilberforce has also the advantage over Mr. Allies in good-temper. Mr. Allies was full of his feelings as 'a free man,' of the 'infamy,' 'degradation,' 'naked infidelity' of Anglicanism; the 'virus of the Reformation' was 'flagrant;' and the English Church was a 'hideous phantom.' Nothing of this sort is found in Mr. Wilberforce. There is one quiet hit at Dr. Wordsworth (p. 17) and another at the Queen (p. 279): otherwise personalities are avoided. Again, Mr. Allies began by showing his teeth in the first page, and by setting his reader as 'a Protestant' at the extremest point of opposition to himself the 'Catholic.' More wisely Mr. Wilberforce begins with what his reader is likely to hold with himself,—'You believe in the Church—you believe that the Church hath

'authority in controversies of faith—you believe the Episcopate to be the medium of Church authority—you think a Hierarchy useful—you don't object to acknowledging a certain kind of Primacy—won't you hold the Supremacy?' This is more telling than Mr. Allies' fashion; not that one way or the other way ought in reason to have influence with a man of clear thought; but we know that we are all more disposed to go along with one who takes us for a part of the journey in the direction in which we are desirous of travelling, and we are less likely to mark the slight divergence of his and our path at the outset than when it is prominently brought before us, that the spots to which they lead are thousands of miles apart.

Setting out on this principle, Mr. Wilberforce avoids startling his reader in his first chapters. His weapon here is exaggeration. For example, it is true that the Church is not 'a mere congeries of individuals,' and that it does 'possess a collective character;' but to illustrate this Mr. Wilberforce uses a metaphor which will naturally lead the mind to accept the doctrine of development: 'By a wall is meant a certain arrangement of bricks, which, when united, are nothing more than bricks still, but a tree is not merely a congeries of ligneous particles, but implies the presence of a certain principle of life which combines them into a collective whole' (p. 2). Mr. Wilberforce's first proposition should not be established on a metaphor which does not only suggest the idea which is needed, but adds to it another idea to which Mr. Wilberforce finds it necessary to have recourse in his after pages (p. 99, &c.). Again—as specimens of the same method—in the second, third, and fourth chapters we find propositions laid down and elaborately proved, with which we heartily agree, but before Mr. Wilberforce leaves them he pushes them on into being something quite different from what they were when he started with them. For example, because we hold with Mr. Wilberforce that 'the Church hath authority in controversies of faith' (p. 7), and that 'the Church is a witness to truth, and also that in matters of conscience its authorities have a claim to attention' (p. 8), we are not therefore bound to cast aside all those other means of arriving at truth which a greater than Mr. Wilberforce has enumerated, viz. Holy Scripture, the existing Church, Tradition, Catholicity, Learning, Antiquity, the National faith, Common sense, natural Perception of right and wrong, the Affections, the Imagination, Reason, and the like<sup>1</sup>. Yet this is involved in the assertion which we

<sup>1</sup> Prophetic Office of the Church, p. 158. 'Most men try to dispense with one or other of these divine informants; and for this reason,—because it is difficult to combine them. The lights they furnish, coming from various quarters, cast separate shadows, and partially intercept each other; and it is pleasanter to walk without doubt and without shade, than to have to choose what is best and safest. The Romanist would simplify matters by removing Reason, Scripture, and Anti-



arrive at in p. 37, that the principle on which the belief in Church authority depends is 'that the Divine Spirit, which has its dwelling in the collective body,' (he means, as the context shows, '*qua* dwelling in the collective body') 'is our *sole* guide in the things of God.' We can contemplate the union in one person of the two characters of a reasonable and reasoning individual Christian and a deferential Churchman.

Again, we can believe that it is to the early Church that we owe the settlement of the canon of Holy Scripture, and we can feel assured, upon that evidence of probability which is by God's dispensation our only guide except in matters of science and revelation, that the canon there fixed, as distinct from that accepted at Trent or elsewhere, is the true canon, and yet we need not see in this act a proof of the inspiration of the Church, and then upon the inspiration thus proved, build up the theory of infallibility, 'that gift of spiritual discernment which had dwelt originally in the person of our Lord, and had been bestowed upon the Apostles' (p. 98). The account left us by Eusebius is entirely inconsistent with the theory that the Church settled the canon by a spiritual discernment and distinctly inspired judgment, rather than because it was 'nearer to the age of the Apostles than ourselves' (p. 28). Mr. Wilberforce builds a great deal on this act of the Church, but there are two objections to his view. The first is the historical evidence, which is to be found throughout the pages of Eusebius, that the early Christians used the ordinary rules of criticism and inquiry in making up their minds as to what were and what were not inspired books. And the second difficulty is that, supposing Mr. Wilberforce's foundation true, still he could not build upon it the doctrine of infallible discrimination *in dogma*, but *in matters of fact*, which proves too much, for he rejects the opinion 'that the Holy Ghost has been given to the Church to enable her to judge about matters of fact' (p. 33).

Once more, we can believe that it was quite right that eating of blood should be allowed, and that the observance of the Jewish law should be prohibited, in the time of S. Augustine, without being driven to the conclusion, that the Church had power to abrogate Apostolic decrees handed down in Scripture, and that the

quity, and depending mainly upon Church authority; the Calvinist relies on Reason, Scripture, and Criticism, to the disparagement of the Moral sense, the Church, Tradition, and Antiquity; the Latitudinarian relies on Reason, with Scripture in subordination; the Mystic on the feelings and affections, or what is commonly called the heart; the Politician takes the national faith as sufficient, and cares for little else; the man of the world acts by common sense, which is the oracle of the careless; the Popular Religionist considers the authorized version of Scripture to be all in all. But the true Catholic Christian is he who takes what God has given him, be it greater or less; despises not the lesser because he has received the greater, yet puts it not before the greater, but uses all duly and to God's glory.—P. 160.

principle on which she possessed this power was, that her authority was equal to that of the Apostles. We can believe that such decrees were intended to be temporary, and that when the necessity for them ceased they thereupon ceased, without equalizing the power of those who determined that the necessity for them was now passed with that of the holy Apostles who instituted them (p. 25).

This method of exaggeration is the peculiar vice of Mr. Wilberforce's mind. He lays down one principle, traces it out to its conclusion, and becomes enslaved to it. He cannot see the force of a counteracting principle: he does not make allowance for the limiting and controlling power of other truths equally certain with that which he is pursuing to its consequences.

This is shown in his doctrine concerning Councils. We believe that the Holy Spirit's guidance is present in the Councils of the Church. We also believe that these Councils are constituted by fallible men. Mr. Wilberforce can see no way of reconciling these two doctrines, except by regarding the Council as a mere mouth-piece of the Holy Ghost, in the same way that the prophets of old were His penmen—having 'that peculiar authority which belongs to them through the promises and indwelling of the Holy Ghost' (p. 79); 'possessed of a living power through the presence of the Holy Ghost, who was believed to dwell in them' (p. 76); like the Church itself, 'possessed of a being and action which was irrespective of the will of its individual members, and was impressed upon it by some higher authority' (p. 2); 'guided in interpretation, not by logical argumentation, but by the Spirit of God' (p. 36). This theory, and more than this, is, of course, necessary for a Church which presumes to coin a new doctrine in the nineteenth century of the Christian era. But nothing can be well more opposed to the teaching of Vincentius Lirinensis<sup>1</sup> (an author of whom Mr. Wilberforce carefully avoids mention, though dealing often with the same subject, which he discussed at the beginning of the fifth century), and of S. Augustine<sup>2</sup>: nor does it account for facts. A different view may perhaps be less

<sup>1</sup> 'The sacred Council held almost three years since at Ephesus . . . in which disputation being had of authorizing rules of faith, lest there might, by chance, some profane novelty creep in, as happened at that perfidious meeting of Ariminum, this was thought the most Catholic, faithful, and best course to be taken, by all the Priests there present, which were about 200 in number, that the opinion of these holy Fathers should be brought forth, of whom it was certain that some of them had been martyrs, some confessors, and that all had lived and died Catholic Priests, that by their consent and verdict, the true religion of ancient doctrine might be duly and solemnly confirmed, and the blasphemy of profane novelty condemned: which being so done, that impious Nestorius was worthily and justly judged to have taught contrary to the old Catholic Faith, and blessed Cyril to have agreed with holy and sacred antiquity.'—Common. c. 29.

<sup>2</sup> 'Even as respects plenary Councils themselves, earlier ones are often improved upon by later, when experience lays open that which was hidden, and makes

striking, and less simple, but not therefore the less true. But we hasten over these points, and similar exaggerations of truths spread through the early chapters—not even tempted to linger for the purpose of throwing back the parallel of the Donatists (p. 81), which Bishop Andrewes has long since shown to be applicable not to ourselves, but to the *exclusive* Roman Church.<sup>1</sup> We are anxious, without further delay, to reach ground where we can meet Mr. Wilberforce front to front.

There are four propositions, which, when we have removed all that is extraneous and ornamental, stand out conspicuous as directed against the position of the English Church:—

1. That after the ascension of the Lord, S. Peter was, by Divine appointment, the head and centre of unity to the Apostles and Disciples, as specially representing Christ,

2. That after the death of S. Peter, the Bishops of Rome were, by like appointment, as inheriting S. Peter's privileges, the head and centre of unity to the Christian Church.

3. That the Bishops of Rome filled this position at first as Primates, afterwards as Monarchs; the Primacy and Supremacy being 'the same power under a different name, and in altered circumstances.'

4. That in the sixteenth century the English Church rejected this divinely-constituted head and centre of Christendom, and assumed the King or Queen of England as the head and centre of unity, thereby cutting herself off from the Church Catholic.

These are the fewest propositions to which Mr. Wilberforce's argument can be reduced, and it is clear that every one of them is necessary for its validity. If he fails in his proof of the first, the

known that which was concealed.—De Baptism. c. Don. 4. Were a Council simply the mouth-piece of the Holy Spirit, no 'experience' of its members could have any effect on its decisions.

'We plainly acknowledge the Catholic Church, as spread everywhere through all lands, nor will we allow that it is bound down to any spot nor circumscribed by any boundaries. But your Pope dares not thus speak—he dares not even use the word *Catholic* without adding *Roman* to it; but by adding *Roman* he overthrows *Catholic*, as though belief were expressed in what is not confined to any spot, and yet was confined to a certain spot. *Roman-Catholic* is the same as saying *particular-universal* or *part-whole*,—it is shutting up the world in a city. A man who believes this is no Catholic,—he is a Donatist, for as they used to believe in an *African-Catholic* Church, so you, who are in every respect similar to them, believe in a *Roman-Catholic* Church. And, as theirs was not the Catholic Church, because it was African, but only Donatus's party, so yours is not the Catholic Church, because it is Roman, but only the Pope's party.'—Tortura Torti, p. 369.

"The Roman Church," says the Cardinal, "has got the name of Catholic." What! a part got the name of the whole, an individual got the name of its species! Let him tell that to his own *Isidori*! for any one who has the least smattering of learning recognises this claim at once as having a sound of Donatus, who said that Christ had deserted the rest of the world, *et in meridie cubare et pascere*, and was not to be found anywhere else except in Donatus's party. Donatus's assertion, however, is the least objectionable of the two, for he did leave a whole quarter of the globe to Christ, and did not thrust Him into one ruined city. The Cardinal is the worst, in so far as Rome is smaller than Africa.—Responsio ad Bellarminum, p. 164.

three others fall to the ground; and in like manner the second is necessary for the third and fourth—the third for the fourth; and if he fails in proving the fourth, he has failed in that for which all the rest were but steps. It would be enough, therefore, for us to choose out any one of these propositions, and disprove it. Our purpose, however, is to show, with respect to *each one of them*, these two things—1st, that Mr. Wilberforce has not proved his statement; and 2dly, that the statement is untrue.

I. The first thing, then, that we have to do is, to show that Mr. Wilberforce has not proved that after our Lord's ascension S. Peter was, by Divine appointment, the head and centre of unity to the Apostles and Disciples, as specially representing Christ, but that the statement here adduced is a false statement.

The obvious course of proof on Mr. Wilberforce's part would be to appeal at once to Scripture, and show from the Gospels that S. Peter was to be the centre of unity to his brethren, and from the Acts and the Epistles that the Church did actually revolve round him. But before making this attempt, Mr. Wilberforce goes on for 250 years, and lays the foundations of his theory in a passage of S. Cyprian—then returns and endeavours to show that the theory so discovered can be made good from Scripture. This course does not exhibit much confidence in the testimony of Scripture, but yet, were it fairly done, we should not find fault with it; but we are constrained to say that it is not fairly done.

Having quoted some passages of S. Cyprian, all of which we shall presently give, Mr. Wilberforce comments as follows:—

'Such are the statements of the earliest writer on the unity of the Church. He supposed that the whole body of Christ was intended to be one; that its unity was to be of a practical kind, enabling it to speak with authority on all questions which should arise; that its utterance was to be through the consentient determination of all its Bishops; and, finally, (which is the point immediately before us) that their co-operation was secured by that peculiar commission which St. Peter had received, antecedently to the general commission to all the Apostles. And this Primacy he supposed to be inherited by the Bishop of Rome, as occupying the "seat of St. Peter," "the principal Church," "the root and mother" of all the rest. Here, then, is a principle, by which that arrangement under Metropolitans and Patriarchs, which constituted the original organization of the Church, as it was instituted by the Holy Apostles, might receive its completion. For if the mutual interdependence among these several authorities issued in a relation to a single head, it was possible to obviate those disputes, which must necessarily arise, so long as the various parts were wholly independent.'—P. 105.

There is a strange number of inaccuracies in this passage, and we regret to say not only in this passage. It is stated first, that according to S. Cyprian the cooperation of all the Bishops of the Churches was secured by S. Peter's commission.—

S. Cyprian makes no such statement. It is stated next, that according to S. Cyprian, S. Peter received a peculiar commission antecedently to the general commission to all the Apostles.—S. Cyprian makes no such statement, but denies it. It is stated next, that S. Cyprian supposed that ‘this Primacy,’ (*i. e.* that by which unity is secured,) is inherited by the Bishops of Rome.—S. Cyprian makes no statement from which such a ‘supposition’ of his could be gathered. It is stated next, that S. Cyprian calls the Church of Rome ‘the root and mother of all the rest.’—S. Cyprian does not use the expression ‘the root and mother of all the rest, of the Churches,’ at all; and the expression, ‘the root and womb of the Catholic Church,’ which he does use, he does not apply to the Church of Rome.

It is stated next, that the arrangement under Metropolitans and Patriarchs was the original organization of the Church instituted by the holy Apostles. Mr. Wilberforce has no grounds for stating that Metropolitans or Patriarchs were instituted by the Apostles beyond his private conjecture. The only necessary elements of Church government are Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. The hierarchy is an arrangement, and a most useful arrangement for ecclesiastical convenience, but it might be swept away at any moment, not without much inconvenience, yet without any injury to the Church in its essential constitution.

It is stated further, that ‘disputes must necessarily arise without a single head,’ and a page or two before, Mr. Wilberforce speaks of the ‘obvious evil, that the Episcopate had certain independent heads who were *as likely* to differ as the worldly leaders ‘of different countries.’ What! This body of which Mr. Wilberforce has such exalted views that he regards the Holy Ghost as dwelling in it in the same sense as He dwelt in our Lord Himself (p. 52)?—this collective Episcopate which he holds to have been endowed with that *grace and truth* with which the Only-begotten of the Father was full (p. 56)? Were the heads of this body, bound thus together by the internal cohesion of the spirit of love, *as likely* to differ as the heads of different countries? Could not that ‘collective body of Bishops, in which the ‘authority of the Church resides, as inheriting that gift of ‘spiritual discernment which had dwelt originally in the person ‘of our Lord, and had been bestowed upon the Apostles—‘bestowed in common and exercised by each as the representative of all’—could not such a body as this fail to quarrel unless prevented by external coercion? Mr. Wilberforce must either give up his lofty views of the nature of the Church, or he must cease to speak of any such form of constitution as monarchy being *necessary* for the preservation of its harmony. *A priori* assumptions of necessity, frequently as they appear in these pages, are wholly out of place on such a subject.

It is stated lastly, that without 'relation to a single head,' 'the various parts were *wholly independent*.' They were not wholly independent; they were bound together by that spirit of love which Mr. Wilberforce recognises as dwelling in the Church. They were bound together by that 'one episcopate which is extended through the accordant multiplicity of many Bishops' (p. 72), that '*Episcopatus unus, cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur*' (*Ibid*); by that system of Metropolitans, Primates, Exarchs, Patriarchs, which Mr. Wilberforce has just declared himself to believe was instituted by the Apostles; and lastly, by their dependence upon the one and only true Head of the Church, the Lord JESUS CHRIST.

We thus find in the compass of fourteen lines one mistranslation, four misstatements, one conjecture asserted as a fact, one *à priori* assumption, one exaggeration, and finally a grave omission of counterbalancing facts and statements. This is not the way for a theologian to gain the confidence of his readers. And we must say here, that before we have done, we shall have other mistranslations, misstatements, conjectures, assumptions, exaggerations, and omissions to point out. We now return to the first of these misstatements, for the purpose of showing that Mr. Wilberforce was not justified in declaring that S. Cyprian teaches, that 'a certain prerogative was bestowed upon S. Peter with a view to *maintaining* the oneness of the body of Christ' (p. 103). This assertion he founds on the passage with which 'S. Cyprian opens his treatise on the Unity of the Church.'

'St. Cyprian opens his treatise on the Unity of the Church by reference to a certain prerogative, which he supposes to have been bestowed upon St. Peter, with a view of maintaining the oneness of the body of Christ. "The Lord saith unto Peter, I say unto thee (saith He) that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven." To him again, after His resurrection, He says, "Feed My sheep." Upon [him being] one He builds His Church; and though He gives to all the Apostles an equal power, and says, "As my Father sent me, even so send I you; receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted to him, and whosoever sins ye retain, they shall be retained;" yet in order to manifest unity, He [has] by His own authority so placed the source of the same authority [unity] as to begin from one. Certainly the other Apostles also were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of power and honour; but a commencement is made from unity, that the Church may be set before us as one; which one Church in the Song of Songs, doth the Holy Spirit design and name in the person of our Lord. My dove, my spotless one, is but one; she is the only one of her mother-elect of her that bare her. He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith?"—P. 103.

Now, in this passage, supposing even that it were rightly

<sup>1</sup> S. Cyprian, Ep. 55, 20.

<sup>2</sup> S. Cyp. De Unitate, p. 107. Ed. Fell.



translated, which is not the case,' we are unable to see one word about *maintaining* unity. We see two things stated very plainly: 1. That all the other Apostles had equality of power and of honour with S. Peter, so that they were what Peter was; whence it follows that, in the writer's view, S. Peter had no special prerogatives whatever, and no peculiar commission, but all the Apostles were alike that which S. Peter was, all partners with equal shares in respect to power and to honour, *hoc erant ceteri quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis*. And we see it stated, 2. That for the purpose of *manifesting* the Church's unity, in order that the Church *might be set before us, or exhibited, as being one Church*,<sup>1</sup> Christ built the Church upon one, and that he established the origin of unity from one. But to do something for the purpose of showing forth the excellence, and give a lesson, of unity, is one thing—to institute an office for maintaining unity is another thing. The first is what S. Cyprian held; the second is what Mr. Wilberforce attributes to him. Our Lord *manifests and sets before us* humility in washing his disciples' feet: he does not institute the office of feet-washing for the purpose of *maintaining and securing* humility.

The truth is that S. Cyprian, with every other doctor of the Catholic Church, before the Decretals of Isidore were forged, and the Church was rent, teaches as plainly as words can teach, that all the Apostles received whatever S. Peter received, and that all Bishops have alike inherited from them. If the Church was built on one, it was built on all; if the keys were given to one, they were given to all. This doctrine being held as an axiom, they further proceeded to inquire, what might have been the reason why it was to *one* especially that our Lord first promised a gift, which promise was to be fulfilled by His bestowing it upon *all* alike. Reverently musing on the subject, they very generally came to the conclusion, that this was done in order to give a lesson that those powers which were delivered to them in common should yet be exercised in unity. This is a subject on which the great African teachers loved to dwell; and S. Augustine, who never passes by the slightest event recorded in Scripture without seeking to find its meaning, brings this point forward again and again. 'When Christ speaks to one, unity is commended';<sup>2</sup> (that is, Christ speaks to one to show the excellence

<sup>1</sup> Instead of 'Upon him being one he builds His Church' it ought to be 'Upon one He builds His Church.' The idea is changed by the two words gratuitously introduced. And, instead of '*He has by His own authority so placed the source of the same authority as to begin from one*,' it ought to be '*He established by His authority the origin of the same unity, beginning from one*.' The meaning of 'Doth the Holy Spirit design and name in the person of our Lord' is 'the Holy Spirit speaking in the person of our Lord, designates, and says.'

<sup>2</sup> Ut Ecclesia una monstretur. <sup>3</sup> S. Aug. tom. v. 1196. Ed. Migne.

of unity,) is the thought again and again repeated by him. S. Cyprian's is the same idea, and from S. Cyprian no doubt S. Augustine inherited it. Our own Hammond has a thought very similar, though not identical:—

'The applying the words particularly to S. Peter hath one special energy in it, and concludes that the ecclesiastical powers of economy or stewardship in Christ's house, of which the keys are the token, belongs to single persons, such as S. Peter was, and not only to consistories or assemblies; that whatsoever S. Peter acted by virtue of Christ's power then promised, he should be fully able to act himself, without the conjunction of any other; and that what he then did *clave non errante*, no one or more men on earth could rescind without him, which is a just ground for placing the power ecclesiastical in single persons, and not in communities—in the Prelate of each Church, and not in the Presbyters.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, in this circumstance, Hammond sees inculcated the authority of the power of the single Bishop; SS. Cyprian and Augustine see the unity of the Episcopate, and of the Church, commended. Both lessons may, we doubt not, be profitably drawn from it, but we cannot find, nor did S. Cyprian teach, that any 'prerogative was bestowed on S. Peter for maintaining the oneness of the body of Christ.'

Having founded his theory upon the passage which has been quoted and considered, Mr. Wilberforce confirms it from S. Cyprian's other writings; and also adduces the passages on which he establishes his two next misstatements, viz. that the Bishops of Rome, according to S. Cyprian, inherited that Primacy by which the cooperation of Bishops was secured, and that the Church of Rome is called by him 'the root and mother of all the rest.'

'This general statement respecting the office of St. Peter, is borne out by the repeated assertions which St. Cyprian makes in his letters, both that St. Peter possessed such a preeminence, and that it had been bestowed upon him for the purpose of preserving the Church's unity. "For to Peter, on whom He built His Church, and from whom He caused the principle of unity to take shape and form, did our Lord first give that power, that what was bound on earth should be bound in heaven." It was Peter, then, "on whom the Church was built by our Lord." He it was "whom our Lord chose as first, and on whom He built His Church," and who "had the Primacy." In another letter he complains that certain malcontents from Africa "dare to sail to the see of Peter, and to the principal Church, whence sacerdotal unity has arisen." But they forget, he adds, that the parties whom they designed to mislead, "were those Romans whose faith was praised by the Apostle, to whom perfidy (*i.e.* faithlessness in doctrine) cannot make its approach." For the Bishop of Rome, according to him, was St. Peter's successor; Cornelius, he says, was chosen to be Pope at a time when "the place of Fabianus, that is, the place of Peter, and the rank of the sacerdotal chair was vacant." He speaks of the Church of Rome as "the root and mother of the Catholic Church," and says that to communicate with its Bishop was "the same thing as to communicate with the Catholic Church." For, "there is one Church, which was founded by Christ

<sup>1</sup> On Schism, p. 243. Oxf. 1849.

our Lord upon Peter, on the principle, and by the law of unity." And during the vacancy of the see of Rome, he appears to recognise the claim to superintendence which was set up by its presbyter, because they say, "it is incumbent upon us, who appear to be put in authority, to guard the flock in place of its pastor." Neither does his correspondent, Firmilian, though exhibiting the utmost hostility against St. Stephen, the existing Bishop of Rome, denying what he states to be St. Stephen's assertion, that "he holds the succession of Peter, on whom was laid the foundations of the Church;" and again, that "he has, by succession, the chair of Peter."—P. 104.

We have already seen that it is necessary to watch Mr. Wilberforce's extracts with jealousy. This will appear more evident when we have examined the present passage. The first extract is taken from the 73d Epistle of S. Cyprian. We give the passage at greater length, and with greater accuracy:—

'For to Peter, in the first place, on whom he built the Church, and from whom he appointed and shewed forth the origin of unity, the Lord gave that power that whatsoever he should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven. He speaks to the Apostles, and after the resurrection also, saying, As my Father, &c. Whence we learn'—what? that S. Peter was the centre of unity? No, but—that they only who are set over the Church, and are appointed by the law of the Gospel and the ordinance of the Lord, may lawfully baptize and give remission of sins . . . that no one can usurp to himself against Bishops and Priests what is not in his own right and power.<sup>1</sup>

Then S. Cyprian did see an exclusive prerogative granted by the words of our Lord; but was it the prerogative of S. Peter? No, it was the prerogative which was received in common by the one Episcopate and Priesthood, of which S. Peter was at a particular moment the symbol.

The words of the second extract are repeated in the third,—

'They say that herein they follow ancient custom . . . but we must not frame a prescription from custom, but prevail by reason. For neither did Peter, whom the Lord chose first, and on whom he built his Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him about circumcision, claim or assume anything insolently or arrogantly to himself; so as to say that he held the primacy, and should rather be obeyed of those late and newly come . . . giving us a lesson of concord and patience, not to love our own opinions obstinately, but rather to count as our own the useful and wholesome suggestions of our brethren and colleagues, if they are true and legitimate.'<sup>2</sup>

We have not the smallest objection to admitting a Primacy in S. Peter. We believe him to have been *primus inter pares* amongst the Apostles. What we object to is the doctrine that he held a Primacy which made him the centre of unity, as being the special representative of our Lord. This passage, however, has probably nothing to do with Primacy of place at all. It seems to refer only to priority of time. In page 130 the passage is again quoted, with the same application. In like manner, we have not the least objection to acknowledging the Church

<sup>1</sup> S. Cyp. Ep. 73, 7, p 201.

<sup>2</sup> S. Cyp. Ep. 71, 3, p. 194.

of Rome to have been 'the principal Church.' The Second and Fourth Œcumenical Councils tell us that it was, and why it was, viz. because Rome was the imperial city; but from the use which Tertullian and the translator of S. Irenæus make of the word *principalis*, we know that it probably means 'early-founded.'<sup>1</sup> That S. Cyprian held the Romans to be infallible, as seems to be darkly hinted, because he used the expression, 'to whom faithlessness in doctrine cannot approach,' cannot unfortunately be the case, unless we believe that he intended to assert that Rom. i. 8, 'I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world,' conveys a grant of infallibility from that time forward to the Romans: for it is to that text which he refers when he speaks of 'their faith being praised by the Apostle.' That the Bishop of Rome was considered by S. Cyprian to have succeeded S. Peter in his episcopate of Rome, which we have next paraded, is an undoubted fact. In like manner he considered the Bishop of Alexandria to have succeeded S. Mark in the episcopate of Alexandria, and we consider Archbishop Sumner to have succeeded S. Augustine in the episcopate of Canterbury. But what does it prove? Mr. Wilberforce says, that S. Cyprian, therefore, supposed that the Primacy—the Vicarial Primacy, as we may term it—which made S. Peter the centre of unity, was inherited by the Bishops of Rome. Now, he never once speaks of the Bishop of Rome succeeding even to *that* Primacy of S. Peter which he *did* perhaps acknowledge, but only to his episcopate of the Roman see.<sup>2</sup>

We next come to the declaration that S. Cyprian 'speaks of the Church of Rome as "the root and mother of the Catholic Church,"' *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem et matricem*; which is given as root and mother of all the rest,' in the next page. Here we have three things to consider: 1, the meaning of *matrix*; 2, the meaning of *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ matrix*; 3, whether or no it is true that it is the Church of Rome to which S. Cyprian applies that expression. 1. The meaning of the word *matrix* is 'womb'; in a derivative sense it is applied to the 'parent-stem' of a plant, as distinct from suckers; to the 'breeding-mothers' of animals; and by a further extension of the derivative sense, it may mean 'source,' or

<sup>1</sup> S. Cyp. Ep. 59, 19, p. 136. See Tertullian, De Præsc. Hæret. c. 31. 'Ad *principalitatem* veritati et *posteritatem* mendacitati deputandam.' And S. Irenæus, lib. iii. c. 3. § 2. 'propter potentiorē *principalitatem*'—seemingly a translation of δὴ τῆς ἰσχυρώτερης ἀρχαιότητος.

<sup>2</sup> 'Cornelius was made *Bishop* by the judgment of God and his Christ . . . . When there had been no one made before him, and the place of Fabian, that is, the place of Peter, and the rank of the episcopal (*sacerdotalis*) chair was vacant.' Ep. 55, 7, p. 104.

'origin.' Tertullian uses the word. He is speaking of the Churches founded by the Apostles, such as Corinth, Ephesus, Antioch, Philippi, &c.; and he calls them the '*matrices et originales fidei*.' Mr. Wilberforce quotes this passage, in p. 94, and translates the word correctly, 'Such Churches which the Apostles themselves founded were considered to be the *wombs* and originals of the faith.' There, where *matrix* was applied to several Churches, Mr. Wilberforce translates it *womb*: here where he represents it to be applied to the Church of Rome, he translates it *mother*. There must be a reason for this difference. Is it because there is an idea of authority conveyed in the title, *mother*, which is not found in the word *matrix*? Or is it that it was desirable to have S. Cyprian's authority for a title which Rome has assumed to herself, although common sense, history, and the canons of the Church, apply it, when it is applied in any special manner at all, to the Church of Jerusalem? As a second step towards assimilating S. Cyprian's expression to the modern assumption, 'mother of the Catholic Church' is changed into 'mother of all the rest,' i.e. of all Churches.

2. What is the meaning of *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ matrix*? Does it mean the womb from which the Catholic Church issued, or the womb of the Catholic Church, in which Christians are formed? Assuredly the latter. We will take the other metaphor; '*Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radix*,' does not mean the root on which the Catholic Church grew, but the root of the Catholic Church on which Christians grow.

3. Does S. Cyprian then say, that it is the Church of Rome which is the root and womb of the Catholic Church?—No, he says nothing of the kind. The case is this: There was the Novatian Schism breaking out in Rome, and S. Cyprian found it necessary to take every measure for the preservation of the unity of the Church. For this purpose he sent messengers and wrote letters to Rome, urging the Romans to acknowledge Cornelius as their true Bishop, and cease to follow the Novatian schism. 'With every exhortation we can,' he writes to the Roman Confessors, 'we beg and beseech you to return to the Church your mother, and to our brotherhood' (Ep. 46). He tells Cornelius that he had written to them to urge them 'to return to their mother, that is, the Catholic Church' (Ep. 47). And then he assures Cornelius, that he had desired every one who sailed from Africa to Italy to 'acknowledge and hold fast to the root and womb of the Catholic Church' (Ep. 48). Is it not clear that 'the root and womb of the Catholic Church' in Ep. 48 is the same thing as 'their mother, that is, the Catholic Church,' in Ep. 47? S. Cyprian warns his

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. De Præsc. Hæret. c. 21.

countrymen, when they sail to Italy, to avoid the Novatian heretics, and hold fast to the Catholic Church, which is the root on which all orthodox Christians grow, and the womb in which they are formed. And this Mr. Wilberforce transforms into, 'He speaks of the Church of Rome as "the root and mother of the Catholic Church—the root and mother of all the rest."' The same exhortation might be given by the Bishop of London to men sailing to the Cape of Good Hope.

We then find that 'He says that to communicate with the Bishop of the Church of Rome, was the same thing as to communicate with the Catholic Church.' We would sooner have made a directly false statement—a statement resting on no foundation whatever—than have written and published that sentence. Liguori himself would not justify it. The Epistle referred to is the 55th, written to Antonianus, who was living in Rome. At the time that S. Cyprian wrote, there were existing in Rome the two parties to which we have made allusion; the orthodox, or Catholic party, headed by Cornelius; the heretical and schismatical party, headed by Novatian. Cornelius had been duly consecrated 'by sixteen fellow Bishops;' and yet Novatian was 'endeavouring by intrigue, to be made 'an adulterous and strange Bishop.' 'And whereas there is 'one Church, from Christ throughout the whole world, divided 'into many members, and one Episcopate diffused throughout 'an harmonious multitude of many bishops, he, notwithstanding 'the unity of the Catholic Church, everywhere compacted and 'joined together, attempts to make a human Church, and sends 'his new Apostles through very many cities, that he may 'establish certain recent foundations of his own institution: 'and whereas there have been already ordained through all the 'provinces, and through every city, Bishops, in age venerable, 'in faith sound, in trials proved, in persecution banished, he 'dares to create other false Bishops over them'. Thus, we see that there were two parties in Rome; the Catholic Church presided over by Cornelius, and a schismatical body presided over by Novatian. Under these circumstances, S. Cyprian writes his letter to Antonianus.

'Cyprian to Antonianus, his brother, greeting. I received your first letter, dearest brother, firmly upholding the concord of the sacerdotal [*i.e.* episcopal] college, and cleaving to the Catholic Church; wherein you signified that you did not communicate with Novatian, but followed my advice, and held one consent with Cornelius our brother-bishop. You wrote also that I should transmit a copy of the same letter to our colleague Cornelius, in order that he might now lay aside all anxiety, and be sure that you held communion with him, that is, with the Catholic Church. But there has since arrived your second letter, sent by Quintus our brother

<sup>1</sup> S. Cyp. p. 131. Oxf. Tr. p. 112. Ed. Fell.



presbyter, by which I see that your mind has been influenced by a letter of Novatian, and has begun to waver.—Ep. 55, p. 101.

Now what would be more natural than for Cardinal Wiseman to write to a friend in New York, and say, 'If you communicate with Archbishop Hughes, you will hold communion with the Catholic Church?' Would that imply that Cardinal Wiseman regarded Archbishop Hughes as the divinely-appointed centre of Christendom? Or again, what more natural than for Bishop Potter to write to a friend in England, and say, 'Avoid the novel *pseudepiscopi* and the schismatical congregations, instituted by Cardinal Wiseman. By communicating with the Bishop of London you communicate with the Catholic Church?' Would he thereby mean that communion with the Bishops of London, past, present, and future, was a necessary condition of Catholic communion? It must be a weak case and a bad cause that requires such forced wrenchings of simple words as this.

The next passage, from Ep. 70, 3, *una Ecclesia à Christo Domino super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata*, repeats the view, that a lesson of unity is taught by our Lord's having addressed himself especially to one of the Apostles. There remains only one more passage of S. Cyprian to be considered, selected from Ep. 8. 1. The facts connected with it are as follows:—Fabian Bishop of Rome was dead, and S. Cyprian had retired from his see in time of persecution. During this vacancy the Roman presbyters write to the Carthaginian presbyters reflecting invidiously upon S. Cyprian for having withdrawn himself from danger, and saying, among other things, 'that it is incumbent upon us,' (*i. e.* on the presbyters in Rome and Carthage respectively,) 'who appear to be put in authority, to guard the flock in place of its pastor' (*i. e.* instead of Fabian in one case, and of Cyprian in the other.)<sup>1</sup> They then proceed to give their brother presbyters some advice as to the lapsed. This letter was forwarded to S. Cyprian, in his place of retreat, by the Carthaginian clergy, and was at once sent back by him to the Roman presbyters, with a note, saying that he could not believe that they had written it, on account, apparently, of the

<sup>1</sup> When we get fifty pages further, this same quotation appears in a strengthened form. In p. 155 it is translated 'because it is incumbent on us who seem to be put in the chief place, (the word is *præpositi*) to guard the flock in the absence of the shepherd;' and on the warranty of this sentence it is asserted, that 'they speak of themselves as exercising a trust which embraced other countries.' Supposing that the *us* did mean only the Roman Presbyters, and not the Carthaginian Presbyters as well, the argument would still be utterly inconclusive. When the President of a college dies, the Vice-President might speak of himself in a letter to a Fellow of another college as feeling that it was incumbent upon him, since he held a position of authority, to guard the college in place of the Head. Would he thereby speak of himself as exercising a trust which embraced other colleges?

unkindly tone toward himself which pervaded it. But, as the presbyters took the same side with S. Cyprian in the dispute about the lapsed, and those times of persecution and division were not days for ceremony, he afterwards wrote and explained why he had withdrawn from death, recounting the measures which he had taken during his exile, with regard to the lapsed, and concluding as follows:—

‘Whereas it seemed right that honour should be shown to the martyrs, and yet the violence of those who desired to throw everything into confusion be checked; and, moreover, having read your letter lately sent to my clergy through Crementius the sub-deacon, to the effect that help should be extended to such as were seized with sickness after having lapsed, and penitently desired communion, I thought it right to abide by that which was also your opinion, lest our conduct, which ought to be united, and agree in all things, should in some respect differ. As to the case of the rest, notwithstanding they have received letters from the martyrs, I ordered them to be entirely deferred, and to be reserved until my return; that so, when the Lord shall have vouchsafed us peace, and several of us who hold rule shall have met together, we may, after communicating our counsels with you too, set in order and restore everything.’—Ep. 20, p. 43.

Here we see an example of Catholic intercommunion, and joint care for the things of Christ, in the two Churches of Italy and Africa, but where is there any ‘claim to superintendence’ made by the Roman presbyters, or any ‘recognition’ of such claims by S. Cyprian? If the Roman superintendence is thus proved, how much more must the Carthaginian superintendence be proved by ‘the most blessed and most glorious Pope’ S. Cyprian himself (so the Roman presbyters call him, Ep. 30), sending to Rome both letters (Ep. 46, 47) and messengers (Ep. 45,) ‘to endeavour to bring back the members of the ‘divided body to the unity of the Catholic Church, and to knit ‘the bond of Christian love.’ Had Cornelius done this to Cyprian, instead of Cyprian to Cornelius, it would no doubt be brought forward as an act done in virtue of his Primacy; for it was an act of interference in the diocese and city of Rome itself, and it was performed for the purpose of securing the unity of the Church.

We will now supply two statements of S. Cyprian, to counterbalance those which Mr. Wilberforce has extracted; the first to show, *ex abundanti*, what S. Cyprian understood by the promise to S. Peter, and the second to point out his view of the real bond of unity in the Church.

‘Our Lord, whose precepts and warnings we ought to observe, determining the honour of a Bishop, and the ordering of His own Church, speaks in the Gospel, and says to Peter, “I say unto thee,” &c. Thence the ordination of Bishops and the ordering of the Church come down along the course of time and line of succession, so that the Church is

settled upon her Bishops, and every act of the Church is regulated by these same Prelates.—*Ep. 33, p. 75, Oxf. Tr.; p. 66, Ed. Fell.*

Then what S. Cyprian understood by S. Matt. xvi. 16—19 was nothing else than this, that the Church was founded upon the one Episcopate.

Again, in the 66th Epistle, he defines the Church as follows:—‘They are the Church, who are a people united to the Bishop (*sacerdoti*,) and a flock adhering to their own shepherd. ‘Whence you ought to know that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop.’ Each diocese was a type of the whole; and what was the bond of unity to the whole? ‘It is,’ he says, ‘in truth connected and joined together by the cement of bishops (*sacerdotum*,) mutually cleaving to each other.’<sup>1</sup> Then the unity of Bishops in godly love is, in S. Cyprian’s view, the bond of the Church, not any prerogative of S. Peter, nor any authority vested in the Bishop of Rome. In Dr. Pusey’s words, ‘S. Cyprian’s idea of the Episcopate is manifoldness in unity; many shepherds feeding one flock; yet therefore many, that they might act in unity against any who would waste it: a large body, but cemented by the glue of mutual concord and bond of unity; many rays, streams, branches, to diffuse everywhere light, fertility, nourishment, yet the connected issues from One Source.’<sup>2</sup> And again, ‘Unity being an effluence from the Unity of God, a fruit of the indwelling of His Spirit, His bond, knitting and joining together His own, typified in the Sacraments and itself a Sacrament, faith in love; its maintenance was not the maintenance of anything outward, but the development of an inward grace—as being a grace, it must emanate from within.’<sup>3</sup>

The best commentary on S. Cyprian’s statements is S. Cyprian’s conduct. Do we, then, find him recognising obedience to the Bishop of Rome, as the instrument for securing unity? On the contrary, the course which he adopts is totally incompatible with such an hypothesis. This appears in two instances—the controversy on Rebaptism, and the dispute about the Spanish Bishops, Basilides and Martial. The former was a serious question of discipline involving doctrine: S. Cyprian, Alexandria, and the East, took one side; S. Stephen, and the rest of the West, the other; and the latter cut off from himself by excommunication all that did not agree with him. Now did S. Cyprian acknowledge the authority of S. Peter’s successor to heal this breach of unity? On the contrary, in Dean Milman’s words, ‘He condemns the perverseness, obstinacy, contumacy of Stephen. He promulgates in Latin a letter of

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 66, p. 207, Oxf. Tr.; p. 168, Ed. Fell.

<sup>2</sup> Pref. Oxf. Tr. p. xviii.

<sup>3</sup> Pref. p. xlii.

'Firmilian, Bishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, still more unmeasured in its censures. Firmilian denounces the audacity, the violence of Stephen, scoffs at his boasted descent from S. Peter: declares that by his sin he has excommunicated himself: he is the schismatic, the apostate from the unity of the Church. A solemn council of eighty-seven Bishops, assembled at Carthage, under Cyprian, asserted the independent judgment of the African Churches, repudiated the assumption of the title Bishop of Bishops, or the arbitrary dictation of one Bishop to Christendom.'<sup>1</sup> The words of this African Council (distinctly approved afterwards by S. Augustine) are as follows:—

'It remains for us each to deliver our sentiments on this matter, judging no one, nor removing any one, if he be of a different opinion, from the right of communion. For no one of us sets himself up to be a Bishop of Bishops, or by force of his tyranny compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience; since every Bishop, according to his recognized liberty and power, possesses a free choice, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another: but let us all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who singly and alone has the power both of setting us up in the government of His Church, and of judging our proceedings.'—*Op. S. Cyp.* p. 329, *Ed. Baluz.*

In like manner, when the Spanish Bishops, Basilides and Martial, lapsed in the Decian persecution, and were accordingly deprived of their Bishoprics, Felix and Sabinus being consecrated in their place,—

'Basilides found his way to Rome, and imposed by his arts on the unsuspecting Stephen, who commanded his reinstatement in his high office: Appeal was made to Carthage against Rome. Cyprian would strengthen his own authority by that of a synod. At the head of his thirty-five Bishops, Cyprian approves the acts of the presbyters of Leon and Astorga in rejecting such unworthy Bishops; treats with a kind of respectful compassion the weakness of Stephen of Rome, who had been so easily abused; and exhorts the Spaniards to adhere to their rightful Prelates, Felix and Sabinus.'—*Milman*, p. 54. *S. Cyp. Ep.* lxxvii. p. 173.

Could S. Cyprian have so acted, had he regarded the authority of the Bishop of Rome over the whole Church as the divinely appointed means of securing the unity of that Church? Could S. Firmilian, twice appealed to by Mr. Wilberforce, have held the same theory, when he speaks of Stephen's 'inhumanitas,' 'audacia,' 'insolentia,' 'res ab eo improbe gestæ,' 'manifesta stultitia,' 'imperitia,' 'contumacis furor discordiæ,' because he took a step by which, had S. Firmilian accepted the theory now thrust upon him, he must have acknowledged that the Bishop of Rome was simply fulfilling the duties of his station, and to which he was bound to pay unhesitating obedience? Could he have said that he was 'betraying and deserting unity?'

<sup>1</sup> Latin Christianity, vol. i. p. 53.

Could he have turned upon him and cried, 'Nay, but thou art worse than every heretic! What struggles and dissension are you spreading through the Churches of all the world! How great a sin have you heaped upon yourself when you cut yourself off from so many flocks! For you have cut *yourself* off. Don't be mistaken. Since he is the true schismatic who makes himself an apostate from the communion of the unity of the Church. For while you are thinking that every one can be separated off from you, you have separated yourself off from every one. And not even the Apostle's precepts (Eph. iv. i.) can fashion you to the rule of Truth and Peace!'<sup>1</sup> All this because Stephen did what S. Firmilian knew that he was bound to do by Christ's command, *if he held the theory* which Mr. Wilberforce attributes to him.

We have now gone through all the passages adduced by Mr. Wilberforce in proof of S. Cyprian's holding the views which he fathers upon him, with the exception of two which are reserved for a note attached to his first extract. We will examine the note too.

'Several other sentences occur in the Benedictine edition, but have not been introduced into the text, because their authority is disputed. And it will be seen that statements equivalent to them occur in St. Cyprian's letters, *e. g.* "Primacy is given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be set forth as one, and the see (cathedra) as one. And they all are shepherds, yet the flock is one, such as to be fed by all the Apostles with unanimous agreement." And again: "He who deserts the see of Peter, on whom the Church is founded, is he assured that he is in the Church?"—*De Unit.* 3, 4.—P. 103.

Now on this we have two remarks to make. First, that Mr. Wilberforce has so arranged his words as to give the impression—an impression which we believe ninety-nine out of every hundred readers would have,—that these are the extracts which come from the genuine Epistles, and are 'equivalent to' the 'disputed' passages which he has omitted; whereas, in spite of the way in which the *e. g.* is introduced, they are the very 'disputed' passages themselves. And secondly, that 'disputed authenticity' is not the term which ought to have been applied to them. Their history is as follows, and it is the more necessary to notice it, as Dean Milman has been deceived by the authority of the Benedictine text into quoting them as genuine, and founding his estimate of S. Cyprian's regard for the Roman Bishops upon them.<sup>2</sup> We quote part of a note attached to the Treatise on Unity in the Oxford Translation of S. Cyprian's works:—

'The additions contained in the Benedictine reading are not found in the first editions of S. Cyprian, (representing probably very ancient and inde-

<sup>1</sup> S. Firm. Ep. ad S. Cyp. cxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Latin Christianity, p. 52.

pendent MSS.,) between A. D. 1471—1563: viz. one at Rome in 1471; one at Venice in the same year; one without date and place; one at Paris, 1512, (according to the Benedictines a very accurate edition, and agreeing with the MSS. when other editions had changed for the worse); that of Erasmus, Basle, 1520; one at Cologne, 1520; of Gravius (a very learned Dominican), at Cologne, 1544 (in which fresh MSS. were consulted); Antwerp, 1541 and 1542; Venice, 1547; and in which list reprints are not included. Nor are the additions found in two extant MSS., each more than a thousand years old. Nor are they found in eight of the Vatican MSS.; and Baluzius numbered up twenty-seven which he had seen in which they were wanting. Bishop Fell mentions nine English MSS., and one of Beneventum, which are without the additions. The passage is quoted without them by Pope Calixtus II. in the twelfth century; by the meeting of Cardinals at Liburnum in the fifteenth; and by the Roman correctors after Manutius had inserted it in his edition. They appear, moreover, to have been unknown to the German MSS. in the age of Venericus (A. D. 1080). For these reasons Baluzius omitted them in his edition of S. Cyprian's works in the beginning of the eighteenth century; but on his dying suddenly, while the work was passing through the press, the Benedictines into whose hands it came, retaining his note in which he gave his reasons against them, cancelled the leaf, and restored them, giving as their reason that the additions had been preserved in all the editions which had appeared in France for the 150 years before their time. . . . Baluzius also, it would seem, spoke more strongly against them than his words now stand; the Benedictines confessing that they were obliged to "alter not a few things in his notes, and that they would have altered more if they could conveniently."—P. 151.

Mr. Wilberforce must not use a tone of generosity, on the ground that he makes use only in a note of passages whose 'authenticity' is *thus* 'disputed.'

We have now examined all the passages which Mr. Wilberforce has adduced from S. Cyprian. We must recollect that he has claimed this especial Father from all the Fathers of the Church, in order to find in him the theory which he requires, and that he professes to find taught in these extracts two leading truths, 1. That S. Peter received a special prerogative from Christ for maintaining (p. 103), preserving (p. 104), securing (p. 105), providing for (p. 119), giving (p. 164), unity, as being himself 'that centre of unity who bore the keys of office in the midst of 'his brethren' (p. 119). 2. That this office and authority, by means of which unity was to be secured, was inherited by the Roman Bishops. We have seen that no such doctrines were held by S. Cyprian, but that, on the contrary, he declares (1) that both in power and in honour all the other Apostles were equal to S. Peter—that he never speaks of his maintaining, preserving, securing, providing for his brethren's unity, or being the centre of unity to them; but he conceives that Christ intending to teach the lesson that the Church was one, and the Episcopate one, and that it was a good and joyful thing to dwell together in unity, addressed himself for that reason espe-



cially to one.<sup>1</sup> And we have seen (2) that he is the energetic and vehement defender of national, of provincial and of diocesan independence; that by word and deed, he and S. Firmilian alike reject every particle of control on the part of the Roman Bishops; that he never in any place asserts that the Bishop of Rome succeeded to any office of S. Peter, except that of presiding over the Roman diocese; that he holds the true Head of the Church to be the Lord JESUS CHRIST (De Unit. 3); and the bond of unity, to be the mutual cleaving of the Bishops to each other by the spirit of love (Ep. lxvi. 7). Mr. Wilberforce's theory is one thing, S. Cyprian's is another. To identify them is impossible.

Having laid his foundation under the shadow of S. Cyprian's name, Mr. Wilberforce returns from the middle of the third century to the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, to see if his theory can be made to agree with them. He says that, 'a primacy is assigned to St. Peter in the Gospels, and recognised 'in the Acts and the Epistles.' It is unfortunate to have to deal with ambiguous expressions. Primacy may signify primacy in place, or primacy in time: and again, primacy in place may mean primacy of power, or primacy of honour; and still again primacy of power may mean fifty different things, according as the degree of power is greater or less. The head-master of a school holds a primacy, the head boy of the school holds a primacy, the head boy in each class holds a primacy, the best cricketer holds a primacy, the best verse-maker holds a primacy, but all in different senses. We must recollect, then, what sort of primacy it is that Mr. Wilberforce has to prove for S. Peter out of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. It is a Primacy which makes S. Peter 'the especial representative of His Master' (p. 111), 'associated by peculiar copartnership in one of the 'functions of His Master, and become by grace that which 'Christ was by nature' (p. 112), which 'especially identifies him 'with his master' (p. 115), which makes him have 'individually 'the trust which his brethren received collectively' (p. 116), which 'makes provision for their unity of action' (p. 119), which constitutes him 'that centre of unity who bore the keys of office in the midst of his brethren' (p. 119). Any passages, therefore, which can be fully accounted for on the theory that S. Peter was *primus inter pares*, the most prominent and first among his equal brethren, is irrelevant to Mr. Wilberforce's purpose, and must be put aside accordingly. Such a Primacy

<sup>1</sup> So his follower, S. Pacian, 'The Lord spake a little above to Peter (He spake to one, that from one He might lay he foundation of Unity;) afterwards, delivering the very same command in common to all, He still begins in the same terms as to Peter.—Ep. iii. 26, p. 348, Oxf. Tr.

as this will not satisfy the necessities of Mr. Wilberforce's argument, which requires what we have called a Vicarial Primacy.

Six points are adduced from the Gospels: 1. That S. Peter's name stands at the beginning of the list of the Apostles' names. Would this be the case were S. Peter simply *primus inter pares*? Yes. Then it proves nothing, and goes towards proving nothing for Mr. Wilberforce's Vicarial Primacy.

2. 'S. Matthew terms him, the first Apostle' (p. 135), and 'the Primacy is attributed to him by the evangelist' (p. 108). Do our readers recollect where? It is in S. Matt. x. 2. 'Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these: the first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother,' &c. If, in giving a list of the English Bishops, we should say, 'The first, Dr. Blomfield, Bishop of London, Dr. Sumner, Bishop of Winchester,' &c., would it be correct to say, that we had 'attributed the Primacy' to Dr. Blomfield? Would the words of the evangelist be naturally accounted for by the supposition that S. Peter was *primus inter pares*? Yes; we should use the same expression with regard to the Bishop of London, but yet we should not mean that he was the centre of unity to his brother Bishops. Then S. Matthew's expression is valueless for Mr. Wilberforce's purpose.

3. 'S. Peter, and S. Peter only, received a new name when he was admitted into the number of the Apostles. Our Lord bestowed the epithet of Sons of Thunder on the two next of his Apostles; but it was an epithet only by which their 'original names were not superseded' (p. 109). First for the fact. The name of Simon was not superseded. The very last time that our Lord addressed him He called him Simon, son of Jonah, and according to the interpretation of Origen, S. Augustine, and others, the name Peter is an epithet, meaning 'a rockman,' and derived from *πέτρα* just as a 'Christian' is derived from *Χριστός*. Further, there is not the smallest difference in the account given by S. Mark of the imposition of the name on S. Peter and on SS. James and John; 'And Simon he surnamed Peter, and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, the Sons of Thunder' (Mark iii. 16, 17). As to 'the name conveying an especial authority to represent Himself,' owing to its 'derivation from Himself,' the name *Christian* is equally derived from Him, and would by the same argument convey the same authority. And so Origen tells us distinctly that Peter, or Rockman, does mean no more than Christian, and that all true Christians are Peters, one title being derived from one name of our Lord, and the other from the other. 'All the followers of

'Christ derive their name from the Rock. . . . Being members of 'Christ, by derivation of name they are called Christians, and 'by derivation from Rock (*πέτρα*) they are called Rockmen (*πέτροι*). And on the same principle you will say that those 'who are called righteous derive their names from the righteousness of Christ, and the wise from the wisdom of Christ, and so 'from all the other appellations you will make derivative names 'for the saints; and to all who are such, the words of our 'Saviour will be addressed: "Thou art Peter," &c., down to ' "shall not prevail against it."<sup>1</sup> This name, then, did not convey anything in S. Peter beyond what was conveyed to the converts of Antioch by the name Christian.

4. and 5. S. Matt. xvi. 18 ('Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church') *directly*, and S. Matt. xvi. 19 ('And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven') *indirectly* declare that S. Peter 'should be associated by peculiar copartnership in one of the functions of 'his Master, and become by grace that which Christ was by 'nature' (p. 112). These are very tremendous words. If they are true, we can see little reason why S. Peter should not have been associated with S. Mary in the ceremony of December 8th. But what is the connexion between these two texts and these words? Mr. Wilberforce finds the following. The name Peter is derived from our Lord's title *petra*; therefore, the imposition of the name Peter implies that Simon was 'associated with' (p. 112), 'especially identified with' (p. 115), 'made the especial representative of' (p. 112)—had Mr. Wilberforce been a little bolder he would have said—'made the one Vicar of Christ.' Exactly on the same reasoning the name Christian is derived from our Lord's title *Christus*. Does then the imposition of the name Christian imply that every one so called is especially associated and identified with Christ, and made his peculiar representative and vicar? Either it does, or it does not. If it does not, neither does the name Peter imply it; if it does, Peter has on this showing no *special* prerogative beyond that which any Christian has.

The argument founded on the other text is still more extraordinary. 'It is Christ who hath the key of the house of David,' therefore this text indicates the transference from him to Peter of 'his office—his function of bearing the keys' (p. 112). Now it is almost certain that a mystical expression applied to Eliakim the son of Hilkiah by Isaiah, and to our Lord in the Book of Revelation, has nothing whatever to do with this text. But be that as it may, it is quite certain, by the testimony of all writers of the early ages of the Church, which Mr. Wilberforce

<sup>1</sup> Origen, in S. Matt. xvi. 18, vol. iii. p. 526.—Ed. Delarue.

is bound on his own principles to accept before an interpretation devised by himself, that no power of the keys was granted to S. Peter in Matt. xvi. 18, which was not granted to all the Apostles in Matt. xviii. 18, and John xx. 22, 23. Accordingly, either all the Apostles have 'become by grace that which Christ was by nature,' or S. Peter has not. For the Patristic expositions of these texts we must refer our readers to 'Papal Supremacy tested by Antiquity,' pp. 37, 48. The words of S. Augustine, S. Cyril of Alexandria, S. Chrysostom, Origen, S. Basil the Great, Theodoret, S. Hilary, S. Gregory the Great, and Ælfric, are all there quoted, and show that the general view of these Fathers and Doctors is, that Christ as confessed by Peter was the Rock of the Church, and that S. Peter was the representative, not of his Master, as Mr. Wilberforce would have it, but of the other Apostles, and therein of the Bishops their successors, and of the Church at large. Many more names of early writers might be added to these, and there is not a single passage in antiquity which bears out Mr. Wilberforce's interpretation. The passages which he quotes from Origen, S. Leo, S. Augustine, S. Jerome, S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, Tertullian, and Hippolytus, are either irrelevant or dead against his view. He acknowledges 'that the word Rock is employed by the ancient writers for two persons and two things—Christ and Peter; the 'objective faith taught by the Lord, the subjective faith taught 'by and entertained by his disciples' (p. 112). This admission in itself would be quite sufficient to overthrow his theory. If these texts meant what he asserts, there *must* have been a perfect knowledge of it in the early Church; they could not have been ignorant of the bearing of words of such importance to themselves and the Church at large; there must have been a universal tradition to that effect. But there was no *consensus* at all. Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges four different lines of interpretation, and no one of them is his own. For what Mr. Wilberforce requires is that they should regard the Church as built upon Peter as the vicar and representative of his Master. On the contrary *all* those writers who regard the Church as built upon Peter at all, consider it built upon him as the representative of his fellow Apostles, upon whom it was equally built, in accordance with Eph. ii. 20, and Rev. xxi. 14, 27.

But Mr. Wilberforce triumphantly asserts, that 'every ante-Nicene writer who refers to the passage supposes that reference 'is made to the *person* of S. Peter' (p. 113). 'Every ante-Nicene writer' sounds authoritative. It calls up in our minds the thought of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, Tatian, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, Arnobius, Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thau-

maturgus, and other well-known names. Are these the authorities to which Mr. Wilberforce refers? No, not one of them. The persons whom he means are Tertullian, Hippolytus, S. Cyprian, Stephen, S. Firmilian, and Origen. These are all he claims in the above high-sounding sentence, and not one of them favours his view. Tertullian thus explains what *he* meant by 'supposing that reference was made to the *person* of S. Peter':— 'On him the Church is built, that is, by his means: he is the 'first to use the key: and you see what key he used: "Ye men 'of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved 'of God among you," &c. Acts ii. 22.'" Then Tertullian understood by the text under discussion, that S. Peter should preach the first sermon, and so make the first converts. Is that of any use to Mr. Wilberforce?

Hippolytus is speaking of the Holy Spirit: 'This is the Spirit 'who at first moved upon the face of the waters... who energized in the Prophets, who descended by flight upon Christ. 'This is the Spirit that was given to the Apostles in the appearance of fiery tongues. By this Spirit Peter spoke those 'blessed words, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living 'God.'" By this Spirit the Rock of the Church was made firm. 'This is that Paraclete,' &c. The original of the last sentence is *Διὰ τοῦτου τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐστερεώθη ἡ Πέτρα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*: and in Latin, 'Per hunc Spiritum firmata Ecclesiæ Petra est.' Mr. Wilberforce says, that in this passage 'Hippolytus 'calls S. Peter "the Rock of the Church.'" It is possible that he might have meant S. Peter by 'the Rock of the Church,' but he might equally well have meant something else. The interpretation 'By this Spirit the Church's Rock was made firm, *i.e.* the Church was made firm as a Rock,' is perhaps the better of the two; but if he does mean S. Peter, he evidently, as we see from the previous sentence, would regard him as the Rock, not as representing, but as confessing Christ.

S. Cyprian, we have already shown to hold that every bishop is as much a successor of S. Peter as the Bishop of Rome, and that S. Peter received nothing—neither power nor honour—which the other Apostles did not receive.

Of Stephen's opinion we know nothing, except what we learn from the following extract from S. Firmilian, who is himself likewise cited as a witness. We give his testimony:—

'What sort of error this man [Stephen, Bishop of Rome] is guilty of, and how great is his blindness in saying that remission of sin can be given in the assemblies of heretics, and in not standing firm on the foundation of the one Church which once has been compacted by Christ upon a rock,

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. de Pudic. c. 21, Op. p. 807. Parisiis, 1646.

<sup>2</sup> Hippolytus in Theophan. 9. Gallandi, vol. ii. 494.

may be understood from hence, that Christ said to Peter only, "Whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;" and in the Gospel Christ breathed on the Apostles only, and said, "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained;" therefore power of remitting sin was given to *the Apostles*, and to *the Churches* which they, being sent by Christ, established, and to *the Bishops* who have succeeded them one after another by ordination in their place (*vicariâ ordinatione*). But the enemies of the one Catholic Church to which we belong, the adversaries of us who have succeeded to the Apostles, while they claim to themselves unlawful priesthoods against us, and erect profane altars, what are they else than Korahs, Dathans, and Abirams, equally wicked and sacrilegious, and to be punished like them, together with their abettors, even as at that time all who took part with those men, and favoured them, perished just as they did? And I do well to be angry with this so open and manifest folly of Stephen, that a man who boasts, as he does, about the place of his Bishopric, and contends that he holds the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church were laid, is introducing many other rocks, and new edifices of many Churches, by giving his authority to the possibility of baptisms being performed in them. For those who are baptized make up, without doubt, the numbers of the Church; and he who approves of their baptism declares that there too there is a Church of the baptized. And he does not see that the true Christian rock (*Christianæ petra veritatem*) is obscured, and in a way utterly destroyed, by him, in thus betraying and deserting unity.—*S. Firm. Ep. ad S. Cyp. c. xii.*

Here S. Firmilian asserts the direct contrary to the two things which Mr. Wilberforce requires. He says that the Bishop of Rome was not the head and centre of unity, but, on the contrary, that he was betraying and deserting unity by leaving the one real Rock of the Church. Could he have said that, if he had taught that the Bishop of Rome was himself the Rock of the Church, and that to be in unity with him was to be in unity with the Church? He gives the reason, too, why, as he believed, Christ spoke to Peter alone in one place, and to the Apostles alone in the other. Does he say, then, that it was for the purpose of making S. Peter his special Vicar? On the contrary, he supposes that the intention was to show that the power of remitting sins was not given to heretics and schismatics, but only to *the Apostles*, to *the Bishops* their successors, and to *the Churches* established by them. Not an atom of authority or dignity does he see bestowed on S. Peter.

The other ante-Nicene authority is Origen. He calls S. Peter 'that great foundation of the Church, and most solid Rock on which Christ has founded his Church.' He does: and he likewise says—

'If we confess like Peter (flesh and blood not having revealed it to us, but light from our Father which is in heaven having shone into our hearts,) we too become that which Peter was, and we equally receive the title of "blessed" with him, because the reason why he was called "blessed" exists in our case too, viz. that flesh and blood has not revealed to us about



Jesus being the Christ, the Son of the living God, but our Father which is in heaven, from heaven itself, that we may have our conversation in heaven. . . . And if we too become Peter after having spoken like Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," (flesh and blood not having revealed it to us, but light from our Father which is in heaven having shone into our hearts,) to us also there will be said by the Word, "Thou art Peter," &c. for every disciple of Christ is a rock. . . . But if you think that upon *that* one Peter only the whole Church was built by God, what will you say about John the son of thunder, and every one of the Apostles?" &c.—*Hom. in Matt. xvi. 18. vol. iii. p. 524.*

So Origen counts the Church to be built upon every sound Churchman as much as upon S. Peter.

But perhaps the method of dealing with S. Augustine is more disingenuous still. Every one knows that the doctrine of S. Augustine, enforced again and again throughout his works, is, that Christ Himself is the Rock, and that upon Him Peter, the representative of the Church, is built. S. Augustine saw four terms, as it were—the Rock: the Church: our Lord: Peter. Our Lord is himself the Rock, and upon Him Peter—*i. e.* all members of the Church are built. His doctrine with regard to the keys is the same. We will give one specimen:—

'Peter in many places of Scripture evidently represents the Church, especially in the place where it is said, "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c. Did Peter receive these keys and Paul not receive them? Did Peter receive them, and John and James, and the rest of the Apostles, not receive them? Or are not these keys in the Church, where sins are daily remitted? But since what was meant was that Peter was representing the Church, what was given to him only was given to the Church.'—*Serm. 149, tom. v. p. 802. Ed. Migne.*

S. Augustine in this, and numberless other passages, regards S. Peter as the representative, sometimes of Christians in their several capacities, sometimes of the collective body of Christians—*i. e.* the Church: 'that He might be the Head, and the other represent the body, that is, the Church' (Serm. 46, 30). But Mr. Wilberforce's argument requires that he should not represent the body, but the head. How is S. Augustine to be made to say what he ought? First his words are forced into meaning that the Church is 'in its chief Bishop,' a sense no more conveyed by S. Augustine's words than Christ's being in Moses is asserted, when it is said that Moses represented Christ, or the Gentiles being in Cornelius is asserted, when it is said that he was the representative of the Gentiles. But this does not go far enough,—it is a step, because 'represented by' has become converted into 'included in;' but yet it is only a step. So one 'Hilary the deacon as it seems,' is brought in to bridge over the abyss. 'Hilary the deacon as it seems,' says that 'as the Apostles were all included in our Saviour by virtue of his

'office, so after our Saviour they are all included in Peter' (p. 115). Now, let us count up the steps. S. Augustine teaches that S. Peter, as representing others, was to be built upon Christ Himself (Serm. 761),—that S. Peter represented the Church which was to be built upon Him, the Rock. If S. Peter represented the Church, says Mr. Wilberforce, the Church was included in him, and 'Hilary the deacon as it seems,' says that the Church was included in Christ: then S. Peter was in this respect like Christ, viz.: that the Church was included in both of them; then Peter was the representative of Christ. *Q. E. D.* Mr. Wilberforce stops there. It follows, likewise, by necessary consequence, that Peter had to be built upon himself, and was both the foundation and superstructure of the Church. But who is this 'Hilary the deacon as it seems?' We know who Hilary the deacon was. He was a contemporary of Bishop Damasus. But who is 'Hilary the deacon as it seems?' (p. 115),—'Hilary the deacon apparently?' (p. 116). The Benedictine editors tell us. The authority to which Mr. Wilberforce has thus referred, is the writer of a supposititious work entitled 'Questions out of the Old and New Testaments,' which had become inserted amongst the works of S. Augustine, and was rejected by the Benedictines as spurious. The author, they say, denied original sin, held Melchizedek to be the Holy Ghost, was a Pelagian, and an Arian. The matter, and manner, and style of his teaching, they assert to be, altogether 'abhorrent to the holy Doctor's mind 'and faith; and, in fine, there are very few questions in the book 'which, one way or another, are not contradictory to S. Augustine's doctrine.' This is the authority which Mr. Wilberforce calls in to reconcile S. Augustine's theory with his theory.

There is yet another misrepresentation in connexion with S. Augustine:—

'The pointedness of our Lord's words were diminished by their trans-  
fusion (*sic*) from his own Syriac into the Greek idiom . . . . In Syriac it appears from the present Peschito version, the term in each member of the sentence is identical. Had St. Augustine, for instance, known that our Lord's words were—Thou art Cepho, and on this Cepho I will build my Church, he would not have employed the argument which he does in his Retractations. For after stating that he had *often* applied the passage to the person of Peter, as he had learned to do from a hymn of St. Ambrose, he adds, as a second interpretation which *might* be given, that "the rock was Christ." And so Peter, named from this rock, would represent the person of the Church, which is founded on this rock, and has received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And then he proceeds on the reasons for giving such an interpretation. "For it was not said to him, Thou art Petra, but, Thou art Petrus." Now, of this distinction between the masculine and feminine words, the original Syriac affords no trace. . . . He has no objections to make against the interpretation which he had traditionally received, save one which arises from the imperfect manner in which the Greek language expresses our Lord's words.'—Pp. 113—115.

Now, what does S. Augustine say?

'I said in a certain place about the Apostle Peter, that the Church was founded upon him as upon a rock, a meaning which is also chanted by many voices in some verses of blessed Ambrose, where he says about the cock—"On its crowing, the very rock of the Church washed away his guilt." But I know that I have *very often* afterwards expounded our Lord's words as signifying that the Church was founded upon Him whom Peter confessed, saying, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;" and thus that Peter (rockman), having received his appellation from this Petra (rock), would represent the Church, which is built upon this Petra (rock), and which has received the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. For it is not said to him, Thou art Petra (a rock), but, Thou art Petrus (a rockman); but Christ was the Rock, and when Simon confessed Him, just as the whole Church confesses Him, he was called Peter (a rockman). Let the reader choose whichever of these two opinions is most probable.'—*S. Augustine, Retract. 1. 21. 1, tom. i. p. 618.*

After the specimens which we have had of Mr. Wilberforce's inaccuracies in his quotations, it is scarcely worth while to pause for the purpose of pointing out that it is not true, as here he asserts, that S. Augustine says that he had '*often* applied the passage to the person of Peter,' and that 'he adds as a second interpretation which *might be given*, that the Rock was Christ.' He distinctly says, that he *only once* so applied the passage, and that once he now places in his Retractions. And the other interpretation he does not introduce as one which *might be given*, but one which he had *very often* given,—in fact, in every passage except in this one early-written letter against Donatus, which has now perished;<sup>1</sup> nor is it 'the interpretation that he had traditionally received' to which he 'objects,' but an interpretation founded on a poetical expression in one of S. Ambrose's hymns, whereas elsewhere S. Ambrose explains that '*the rock is Christ*,' though he allows that every Christian may become *a rock* by faith, for 'faith is the foundation of the Church; and not of the flesh, but of the faith, of Peter, was it said, The gates of hell shall not prevail against it; his Confession conquered hell.' But suppose that S. Augustine had used both interpretations commonly, does not the very declaration that the adoption of one or the other is indifferent, show that he did not lay any stress upon the personal reference to S. Peter as involving doctrine? Whereas Mr. Wilberforce sees in it 'an elementary portion of the Gospel revelation,' and compares it in that respect to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity (p. 105).

The argument from the Syriac Mr. Wilberforce brings forward as boldly as though it had never before been advanced

<sup>1</sup> Serm. 76, c. i. tom. 5, p. 479; Serm. 295, c. i. p. 1348; Serm. 244, § i. p. 1147; Serm. 270, § 2, p. 1239; Serm. 149, p. 802; are all selected from one volume of Abbé Migne's edition of S. Augustine, in *Papal Supremacy*, &c. p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> S. Ambr. tom. iv. p. 143, and tom. vi. p. 494.

and refuted. We repeat the refutation of a repeated misstatement:—

‘To evade the force of the words *Upon this rock*, the Papists, Bellarmine Maldonate, Petrus de Bollo, and others, object it was not the Greek, but the Syriac language, wherein our Saviour spoke these words to Peter; in which language כִּיפָא signifies both Peter and a stone, without any change of gender. To which I answer—1. It is true our Saviour spoke these words, not in the Greek but Syriac language; but, howsoever, S. Matthew wrote them not in Syriac, but in Greek, and therefore it is the Greek that is the original, not the Syriac. But, 2, it is plainly false that כִּיפָא signifies both Peter and a stone, *without the change of the gender*, or in the same gender, for that כִּיפָא, as it denotes Peter, is of the masculine gender, I hope they will not deny. . . . . whereas כִּיפָא, for a stone or rock, is always of the feminine, as “Jacob accepit Cepha et erexit eam.”—(Gen. xxxi. 45.) So “Cepha probata angularis pretiosa” (Is. xxviii. 16); “Cepha magna erat” (Mar. xvi. 4); and so elsewhere. Nay, 3, in this very place too כִּיפָא, when spoken of Peter, whose name it was, is of the masculine, but when used for a rock or stone is of the feminine gender: כִּיפָא הוּא, not כִּיפָא, which is a pronoun of the feminine gender. And therefore it is in vain to seek any elusion of the place from the Syriac, that being as plain against them as the Greek; for as in the Greek πέτρος and πέτρα are of different genders, so are the first and second כִּיפָא in Syriac of different genders too.’—*Beveridge on Art. XXXVII.*, vol. vii. p. 582, Oxf., 1845.

Before leaving this text we will in a few words sum up the interpretations which have been given to it. By some the Rock is supposed to mean Christ; this is the interpretation of S. Augustine, S. Ambrose, S. Gregory, S. Jerome, Bede, &c. According to some it means the Faith and consequent Confession of S. Peter: this is the view of S. Chrysostom, S. Cyril of Alexandria, S. Hilary, S. Gregory Nyssen, S. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> S. Gregory the Great, Theodoret, Theophylact, Ælfric,<sup>2</sup> &c. Some take it to mean S. Peter, as representing the other Apostles: this is the interpretation of S. Basil, S. Cyprian, S. Firmilian, S. Jerome. Some hold that it means S. Peter as representing all sound Churchmen: this is Origen’s explanation. Some consider S. Peter to be meant as having been the first and great instrument of converting the Jews to Christianity on the day of Pentecost, opening the door to the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius, and teaching the mysteries of the faith; this is the view of Tertullian, Epiphanius, &c., and is

<sup>1</sup> It will be seen that sometimes the same Fathers give in different places different interpretations. Not considering that any special doctrine was involved, they naturally drew as many edifying lessons as they were able from the words.

<sup>2</sup> A Trans-Atlantic contemporary, in an able article on ‘The Question of the Papacy,’ states that ‘Thirty-five of the ancient Fathers are reckoned as holding the opinion, that S. Peter’s confession is the Rock. To these must be added at least six of the early Popes; while the exposition is also recognised in a prayer in the Missal of the Roman Church, in the Mass for the Vigil of S. Peter and S. Paul, which, referring to this text, has the expression, “the rock of the apostolical confession.”’—*Church Review*, New Haven, Conn., Oct. 1854, p. 388.

supported by Mr. Alford in his Commentary. Every one of these views is tenable, and finds support among the writers and Fathers of the Church. Mr. Wilberforce's view, on the other hand, that S. Peter is the Rock, as specially representing Christ (*i. e.* as His special vicar) is untenable, and is not supported by a single Father, or a single early writer, unless a sentence may perhaps be so construed, which is found in the writings of a Pelagian and Arian heretic, 'Hilary the deacon as it seems.'

5. and 6. The fifth proof may be passed over very summarily, for Mr. Wilberforce does not bring forwards a single authority for his interpretation of Luke xxii. 31, 'Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired,' &c. except his friend 'Hilary the deacon apparently.' We prefer the consentient exposition of antiquity, which teaches that the meaning of the text is, that our Lord prayed that Peter might not fall away from the grace of God in the trials which were coming upon him. In the sixth we desiderate Bellarmine's notable explanation of *πολύαινε μὲν τὰ πρόβατα*—'Rule as king over Jews, Gentiles, and Bishops,' and find two passages, one from S. Chrysostom, that 'Jesus putteth into his hands the chief authority [*προστασία*, first place] among the brethren,' and one from *Saint Optatus*. With regard to the first, had Mr. Wilberforce looked on a few verses further, he would have found that, according to S. Chrysostom, the world was entrusted just as much to S. John as to S. Peter—and had he looked in the previous volume of S. Chrysostom's works, he would have seen, that so far from regarding the words, 'Feed my sheep,' as addressed in any special manner to S. Peter, the saint says, 'This is addressed not only to priests but to every one of us: each one of us has a sheep to conduct to its right pasturage.'

With regard to *Saint Optatus*, first, we have to say that he is not a *saint*, and secondly, that the passage which Mr. Wilberforce has quoted is most likely a forgery. The method by which Optatus became sainted is the following:—When Baronius was drawing up his edition of the Roman Martyrology, he found that Peter Natalis had made a confusion between Optatus, Bishop of Antissiodorus, and Optatus, Bishop of Milevis; and whereas it was Optatus of Antissiodorus' festival, which fell upon August 31, Peter Natalis had substituted Optatus of Milevis. Baronius rectified the mistake: but what was he to do with the Bishop of Milevis? After he had once been admitted to the catalogue, it was hard to dismiss him so rudely, and his writings (being largely interpolated) were useful for strengthening the Papal claims: so Baronius kindly found him a place on June 4, and thus Optatus became a saint. The passage quoted by Mr.

<sup>1</sup> Tom. vii. p. 785, Ed. Bened., 1727. Papal Supremacy, &c. p. 44.

Wilberforce is taken from the seventh book of Optatus' work against the Donatists, the whole of which book is generally considered a forgery. S. Jerome says that Optatus wrote only six books. Optatus says that he was only going to write six books: the seventh very often contradicts the six others, and its style is totally different.

Such are Mr. Wilberforce's 'proofs' from the Gospels. We shall not occupy our space in dwelling on the counter-balancing statements, such as S. John's, and S. James', and S. Paul's, special privileges, which might be counted up in the same manner as S. Peter's; the equality of the twelve thrones in S. Matt. xix. 27; the request of Zebedee's children in S. Matt. xx. 20; the unmonarchical character of his kingdom in S. Mark x. 42; the disputing among the disciples for superiority in S. Luke xxii. 24; the special words of reproof as well as of honour addressed to S. Peter, and the rest of the passages which might be referred to. We are not careful to linger over this point, for we are persuaded that Englishmen, who have all their lives been accustomed to the Scriptures, will never be induced to believe that any special vicariate of S. Peter is taught in them, unless they find that there is a universal consensus of the Doctors of the early Church to the effect that certain texts are to be interpreted as testimony of that vicariate. We have shown that there is a universal consensus against that interpretation.

In the Acts and Epistles we have six more points brought forward. These will not detain us long. 1. '*In the first portion of the book which describes the actions of all the Apostles, S. Peter is so entirely prominent that his position might almost be compared with that which our Lord Himself while upon earth occupied towards his disciples*' (p. 122). We reply, '*In the latter portion of the book S. Paul is so entirely prominent that his position might equally well be compared with that of our Lord's.*' 2. It is Peter who works the miracles of healing the lame man; it is Peter who condemns Simon Magus, Ananias and Sapphira; it is Peter who admits the Gentiles. We reply, it is Paul who raises Eutychus; it is Paul who condemns Elymas, and casts out the spirit of divination; it was Paul who had the Apostleship of the Gentiles; and it was the Church in Synod assembled which sanctioned their admission. 3. '*At the Council of Jerusalem the ancient writers see no sign that S. Peter was wanting in authority*' (p. 125). In proof several passages of S. Chrysostom are quoted. (1) '*Great effrontery this of the Pharisees, that even after faith they set up the law and will not obey the Apostles.*'<sup>1</sup> What has this to

<sup>1</sup> S. Chrys. Hom. in Act. xxxii. 2



do with S. Peter? (2) 'Observe he first permits the question 'to be moved in the Church, and then speaks.' (Ibid.) On which Mr. Wilberforce comments, 'He refers especially to 'S. Peter as having *allowed* the discussion to have its course, 'and having then *stepped in with authority*.' Mr. Wilberforce represents it an act of condescension. S. Chrysostom is speaking of it as an act which showed his wisdom—he let the complainants speak first: then, and not till then, he replied, and 'advanced gradually' to the point which he wished to prove—there is nothing whatever about stepping in with special authority. (3) 'Our Lord putteth into S. Peter's hands the chief 'authority (position) *among* his brethren,' *i.e.* he was *primus inter pares*, except in the diocese specially appointed to one—a thing which we do not dispute. (4) 'He asks the question, "How then did James receive the chair at Jerusalem?" His 'answer is that Christ "appointed Peter teacher not of the chair 'but of the world"' (p. 126). Was it fair in Mr. Wilberforce to quote this comment on John xxi. 19 without adding that on John xxi. 23 S. Chrysostom says that S. John was 'to receive 'the charge of the world' equally with S. Peter? And that elsewhere he speaks of S. Paul as 'an Apostle of the world,— 'charged with the care of cities, and peoples, and nations, nay, 'of the whole world,—the planter of the Church,—the tongue 'of the world, the light of the Churches, the foundation of the 'faith, the pillar and ground of the truth'—who 'excelled all 'men who have been since men first were?'<sup>1</sup> (5) Mr. Wilberforce says that according to Chrysostom, the reason why S. James closes the discussion is, that he was Bishop of Jerusalem, but that there is nothing in this circumstance which implies him to have been superior to S. Peter. Would it not have been well to have given S. Chrysostom's words here as well as in all the other passages? They are as follow:—'James restrains himself and 'does not leap up; for it was he that was invested with the chief 'rule (*τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγκεχειρισμένος*). No word speaks John 'here, no word the other Apostles, but hold their peace; and 'they think it no hardship, so clean was their soul from the love 'of glory . . . *Peter, indeed, spoke at the beginning more strongly, but 'James speaks more mildly, for thus it behoves one in high authority '—(ἐν μεγάλῃ δυναστείᾳ) to leave what is unpleasant for others 'to say, while he himself appears in the milder part.*'<sup>2</sup>

4. 'In the Epistle to the Corinthians, where S. Paul often 'mentions S. Peter's name, the order observed *always* points out

<sup>1</sup> S. Chrys. in Ep. 1. ad Cor. ix. 2. In Ep. 2 ad Cor. xi. 28. Hom. de Fil. Zeb. Or. 1, in Rom. xvi. 3. De Laud. S. Pauli, Or. 2. We have taken these five references from Mr. Scudamore's 'England and Rome,' p. 151, an able, useful, and learned book, written calmly, and, what is of great price, fairly.

<sup>2</sup> S. Chrys. Hom. in Act. Apost. xxxiii. Op., tom. ix. p. 255.

'his priority' (p. 126). We might answer, 'In the Epistle to the Galatians, where S. Paul mentions S. Peter's name, the order observed points out no priority, for it is placed between James and John.' We might also answer, that in two out of the four places in the Epistle to the Corinthians in which it is used, it does not naturally point out any priority; and we might further add, that a position of priority would be what we should expect on the hypothesis of S. Peter being *primus inter pares*: this, then, is nothing in favour of Mr. Wilberforce.

5. 'When S. Paul speaks of going up "to see Peter," they 'all understand this to be a mark of respect, paid by one whom 'our Lord had added to their number by immediate appointment, to the chief of the Apostles' (p. 187). Those quoted are Tertullian, Marius Victorinus, Hilary the Deacon, S. Jerome, S. Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The quotation from Tertullian is irrelevant, and its apparent application rests on the misunderstanding of one of the words.<sup>1</sup> Hilary the Deacon (this is not 'Hilary the Deacon, as it seems,' though it is still doubtful whether it is the genuine Hilary) does not represent S. Paul as being in an analogous position towards the Churches of the Gentiles as S. Peter towards the whole Church, according to Mr. Wilberforce's statement, and he is only made to appear to do so by half-sentences being quoted. Had the whole passage been fairly given, it would have been seen that he places S. Paul upon an exact equality with S. Peter, the latter holding the primacy amongst the Apostles of the circumcision, and the former holding the primacy amongst the Apostles of the uncircumcision. 'So, however, that Peter might preach to the Gentiles if there were cause, and Paul to the Jews: for they are both found to 'have done so. But still in preaching to the Jews full authority 'is distinguished as given to Peter, and the authority of Paul 'in preaching to the Gentiles is found perfect.' And again: 'that he (Paul) should be thought worthy to have the primacy 'in preaching to the Gentiles, as Peter had in preaching to the 'circumcision.' The 'Apostles' amongst whom S. Peter has the primacy are only *Apostoli circumcisionis*, and S. Paul holds the same position amongst the *Apostoli gentium*. If anything, a higher station is assigned to S. Paul than to S. Peter, for he says: 'Each of them received his dispensation in proportion to 'his strength; for it was more difficult to attract to the faith 'and convince those who were far away from God, than those 'who were very near.'<sup>2</sup> These are words which Mr. Wilberforce

<sup>1</sup> 'Ascendit Hierosolymam, cognoscendi Petri causâ, ex officio et jure scilicet ejusdem fidei et prædicationis.' De Præscript. c. xxiv. *Ex officio* cannot mean 'as a matter of duty' towards S. Peter.

<sup>2</sup> App. in S. Ambr. tom. ii. p. 216.

not only fails to quote, but he omits them although making part of the passage from which he has extracted certain portions of two sentences.

The other authorities, while they show themselves irreconcilably opposed to Bellarmine's dictum, that S. Paul, and all the other Apostles, received their jurisdiction, mission, and ordination from S. Peter, do not go beyond what we should expect them to say, on the hypothesis that S. Peter was *primus inter pares*. Mr. Wilberforce, having made his extracts from them, concludes thus: 'These writers, then, attributed to S. Paul an immediate and independent commission from our Lord, such as he bestowed on all the Apostles; but they represent him to have recognised that priority of S. Peter which was designed to secure the unity of the Apostolic body.' We repeat, that that priority 'which was designed to secure the unity of the Apostolic body,' is a thing totally different in kind from that priority which made S. Peter first amidst his brethren. The latter, S. Chrysostom and others did recognise; the former, is wholly unknown to them.

6. When S. Peter was rebuked by S. Paul, Mr. Wilberforce thinks that the latter's act was that of an inferior. We leave that point to our readers' judgment.

Again, we shall not linger over the counterbalancing statements. They are well known: the appointment of S. Matthias; the appointment of the deacons; S. Peter and S. John being sent by the Apostles; S. James presiding and giving sentence in the Council of Jerusalem; S. Peter recognising S. Paul's apostolate of the Gentiles, and withdrawing himself into the ministration of the Gospel of the circumcision; the reproof of S. Peter by S. Paul; S. Paul's vindication of his independent and equal authority; S. Paul's declaration that on him came 'daily the care of all the Churches'—a form of speech assumed to themselves in later times by the Bishops of Rome, and which would doubtless have been brought forward as an irrefragable proof of the Supremacy, if only S. Peter had used it instead of S. Paul—the expressions employed by S. Peter himself in his Epistles; the exact equality, according to measurement, of the twelve foundations of the 'great city, the holy Jerusalem,' 'the bride, the Lamb's wife,' which had 'on them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb:' these are some of the special passages bearing on the point; but the great proof is the spirit and tone which pervades the whole of the Sacred Writings.

We submit that Mr. Wilberforce has not made out his first point; he has not shown that S. Peter was head and centre of unity to the Apostles, as our Lord's representative after His departure hence; that he has vainly attempted to fasten that

doctrine upon S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, and other great Doctors of the Church; that he has vainly attempted to find it in Scripture, and can get no early writer to agree with him, except one Arian and Pelagian heretic, who thought Melchizedek was the Holy Ghost. On the contrary, we maintain that the powers and the commissions of all the Apostles were exactly equal; that this is witnessed to by Scripture, and held universally in the early Church; that there is not one early writer, with the exception possibly of Optatus and S. Jerome (whose words we shall presently examine), who supposed that S. Peter had any peculiar office of securing unity; that there is not one, except the Arian heretic above mentioned, who regarded him as a special representative of his Master; and that there is, in truth, no special 'Vicar of Christ on Earth,'<sup>1</sup> except the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, whom Christ promised to send in His own place, (John xiv. 16,) and who is the Bond of Unity to His Church.<sup>2</sup>

II. We proceed to the second point. The bishop of Rome was not the head and centre of unity to the early Church.

We have seen that the main argument of Mr. Wilberforce heretofore has rested on the ambiguity of the word 'Primacy'. Sometimes S. Peter's 'primacy' is a certain 'superiority' (p. 142), 'his prominence' (p. 124), 'a certain primacy in the college of the Apostles' (p. 110), he is 'the first Apostle' (p. 116), 'the chief Apostle' (p. 121). Now, substitute Bishop for Apostle, and it will be seen that we might give all those titles to the Bishop of London. Such a primacy as that we are ready to admit; the earliest ecclesiastical historian says that he did 'take the lead of

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges (p. 99), that the principle of the *Ancient Church* was, that every Bishop 'represented the person of Christ, and was Christ's Vicar, the Father of the people (*papa*):' which would necessarily exclude the later Papal notion. Mr. Wilberforce incorrectly quotes the words, 'Christ's Vicar,' as though they were S. Ambrose's; they are Hilary the Deacon's, who says that a Bishop, like a Judge, is *Vicarius Domini*, the Vicar or Representative of his Lord.—App. S. Ambr. ii. 143.

<sup>2</sup> So Tertullian, *De Præscript. Hæret.* c. xxviii. 'Spiritus Sanctus, ad hoc missus à Christo, ad hoc postulatus de Patre, ut esset doctor veritatis. . . *Dei Vilius, Christi Vicarius.*' Thus too, Bishop Andrewes: 'Belong ye then to your Roman Catholic Church, a thing not found in the Creed, and we to that in which we believe,—a Church which is simply Catholic, not restricted to Rome, but such as we profess in the Creed—a Church which is orthodox; which does not bow down to or worship any image (Exod. xx. 4); which does not worship it knows not what (John iv. 2); which bids all drink from Christ's cup (Matt. xxvii. 27); which prays in the spirit, and prays with the understanding likewise (1 Cor. xiv. 15); which does not call on them on whom it believes not (Rom. x. 4); in which Christ is the Head of the Faith, and the Holy Spirit His Vicar (John xvi. 7). To this we belong, and profess to belong: and you, since you have many of the doctrines of the Catholic Faith still remaining among you, though in part corrupted, we are able to call members of the Catholic Church, but not sound members.'—Tortura Torti, p. 495. In the same manner, King James I. '*Christus Ecclesie suae monarcha est, Christique vices explet, quem venturum promiserat, Spiritus Sanctus.*'—Præf. Mon. in Apol. pro Jur. Fidel.

the rest,' and he tells us the reason, 'on account of his courage;' and such a primacy as that is admitted by many, not by all—it was an indifferent matter—of the early Christian writers. But by-and-by this harmless preeminence designated by the word 'Primacy,' becomes a very different thing. Now it is the 'peculiar and characteristic commission given to S. Peter by our Lord' (p. 117), 'it is the peculiar provision made for securing the unity of the Apostles' (p. 118), it makes S. Peter 'the centre of unity' (p. 119), it gives him a peculiar 'office' (p. 138), it 'associates him to our Lord's own office' (p. 140), it 'associates him, by peculiar copartnership, in one of the functions of his Master, and makes him become, by grace, that which Christ 'was by nature' (p. 112), it makes him 'the especial representative (vicar) of Christ' (p. 112), and the Fathers who have allowed the first-described 'Primacy' are cited as having acknowledged the last (p. 128).

The next step is likewise grounded on an ambiguity. Are the Bishops of Rome S. Peter's successors? Yes; S. Irenæus says that they are successors of SS. Peter and Paul (p. 134), S. Cyprian says that they succeeded S. Peter (p. 136), Tertullian says that Clement was appointed by S. Peter (p. 136), S. Augustine asserts that from Linus to Anastasius they all succeeded S. Peter (p. 141). But how did they succeed? Of course as Bishops of Rome, just as Annianus and Avilius succeeded as Bishops of Alexandria, Evodius and Ignatius as Bishops of Antioch, and Symeon and Justus as Bishops of Jerusalem. But this succession *in the Roman episcopate* is wholly irrelevant: the question is, as Mr. Wilberforce fairly states it, had he any successors *in the Primacy*? Now, there is not a single one of these writers who have been quoted as witnesses 'that the Bishop of Rome is S. Peter's successor,' who gives the slightest hint that he meant that the Bishops of Rome succeeded S. Peter in any other capacity than as Bishops of Rome. They mention an historical fact, which may also be found in every historian from Eusebius to Dean Milman. But, says Mr. Wilberforce, 'Since the Church of Rome was spoken of in ancient times as the see of S. Peter, though S. Paul also 'was one of its founders, the commission transmitted by the 'other Apostle must surely have been characteristic and peculiar. For why should this Church have been so especially 'associated with the name of S. Peter, unless there was 'something specific in the commission which he transmitted' (p. 137)? So the proof of S. Peter's being succeeded by the Bishops of Rome in his (supposed) vicarial Primacy is, that the

<sup>1</sup> Τὸν καρτερὸν καὶ μέγαν τῶν ἀποστόλων, τὴν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων προηγμένον, Πέτρον.—Euseb. ii. 14.

see of Rome came to be called the see of S. Peter instead of the see of S. Peter and S. Paul!—a slender thread on which to hang the weight of the Papacy. If it were true, would it not be fully accounted for by the very simple fact, that 'the see of S. Peter and S. Paul' is a lengthy expression, which would naturally have become shortened into 'the see of S. Peter?' It is not, however, universally true, for the Bishops of Rome are very often spoken of as successors to both the Apostles, and Eusebius places the name of S. Paul before that of S. Peter,<sup>1</sup> a fact which would more than counterbalance 'Dionysius of Corinth putting S. Peter first, as one of the two who had 'planted the Church at Corinth, and thereby associated it 'with Rome' (p. 137), if it were true that Dionysius had 'done so. But he has not. He says, 'You, too, by means 'of this admonition, have again united that which was planted 'by Peter and Paul *at Rome* and Corinth. For both of them 'having come to our Corinth and planted us, taught us alike, 'and having in like manner taught in Italy they suffered 'martyrdom about the same time.' Whether Dionysius places the name of Peter before that of Paul, or of Paul before that of Peter, is about as unimportant a thing as could well be; but it is evident that he is there speaking not only of their preaching at Corinth, but, as he says, at Rome.

Mr. Wilberforce has another argument. He says that 'it may be objected,' that it was only the general Apostolic commission, not the peculiar Primatial commission, which was bestowed upon the Roman Bishops. This 'objection' he meets as follows:—

'It proceeds upon the supposition that St. Peter's power consisted of two portions, one of which expired with himself, while he handed on the other. Either, then, we ought to find some ancient statement that his functions were understood to be thus divided; or such an arrangement, though not expressed in words, must have been implied in the manner in which his office was dealt with. But neither of these suppositions is maintainable. Our Lord's promise of His continual presence, the conduct of the Apostles themselves, and the belief of their first disciples, had led the ancient Christians to the conclusion, that the commission bestowed upon the Twelve was given for the permanent guidance and administration of the Church. But nothing indicates that the commission of the other eleven was supposed to be more durable than his whom St. Matthew terms the First Apostle. No ancient Church-writer attempts to discriminate between his powers, and to show that the one part of them was merely personal, the other transferable.'—P. 135.

Mr. Wilberforce *does* himself hold this distinction of powers and functions in S. Peter—the general commission given him as an Apostle, and the peculiar commission given to him by our Lord (p. 117)—the Apostolic and the Primatial authority (p. 135)—

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. ii. 25; iii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. ii. 25.



his ordinary commission as an Apostle, and his office of Primate (p. 138). Starting with this assumption, he here argues that unless ancient Church writers discriminate between these *powers*, and show that one part of them was merely personal, the other transferable, it is reasonable to suppose that they believed them to be both transferable, and that they were accordingly transferred. But there is one good reason, we think, why ancient Church writers should not have done so; and that is, that they none of them recognised or believed in 'this peculiar commission,' this 'Primal authority,' this 'office of Primate.' They all regarded S. Peter as having received the same commission, authority, and office with the rest of the Apostles, and none other: as S. Cyprian says, '*the other Apostles were that which Peter was; endowed with an equal fellowship (pari consortio) both of honour and power.*'<sup>1</sup> The primacy which some of them admitted was no *power* or *office* at all but a *prominence*. As, therefore, they did not hold that S. Peter had peculiar powers, it is not likely that they would have gone out of their way to say that those peculiar powers, of which they were totally unaware, were not transferred to Linus. Yet, says Mr. Wilberforce, unless they do so, we ought in reason to believe that it was. He acknowledges that it was only '*in later times*' that 'it has been found convenient to discriminate the several ideas which were involved in S. Peter's office, and to point out what was peculiar to himself, what common to his brethren . . . . That which is common to all Bishops has since been called the power of Order, and Mission has been the name given to that authority which arranges when, how, and where the power of Order shall be used' (p. 135). He does not tell us *when* it was thus 'found convenient to discriminate' these several ideas. Mr. Allies supplies the deficiency.

'But when this fraud (the Decretals) was discovered, the defenders of the Pope's unlimited power, the great school of S. Ignatius Loyola, set themselves with unexampled energy, skill, and unity of purpose, to build up the breach. Theirs are those very clever but arbitrary divisions which Mr. Thompson assumes to be the "Catholic faith," i.e. the separation of the Bishop's power into that of orders and that of jurisdiction, allowing that all Bishops are equal as to the first, but restricting the last to the Pope; the asserting that S. Peter's power was ordinary, but that of the Apostles extraordinary; that S. Peter had a successor to all his power, but the Apostles none to theirs; that the Bishops are successors of the Apostles only as to orders, not as to jurisdiction; that the Pope's jurisdiction comes from Christ immediately, but that of other Bishops from the Pope; that the Apostles were equal to each other in all points but one, viz. that the exercise of all their powers depended upon union with Peter, which totally destroyed their equality. These and such-like are very clever, but wholly

<sup>1</sup> De Unitat. i. Such passages might be multiplied *ad libitum*. See Scudamore's England and Rome, p. 140.

arbitrary, and, moreover, *ex post facto* defences of the plenitude of Papal power, which was really introduced by the belief of Western Europe in the authenticity of the false Decretals.—Pref. p. xiv.

So we are to believe that the Early Fathers taught that an authority was transferred to Linus and his successors which did not exist, which they did not believe to exist, which they incidentally deny to have existed, and the clever arguments for the existence of which the Jesuits first invented in the sixteenth century, *because* they do not in so many words declare that such authority was *not* transferred. It might as reasonably be inferred that our forefathers were acquainted with the power of steam on the grounds that they have not written treatises to deny it.

It has been taught, and rightly taught, that all Bishops are successors of S. Peter equally with the Bishop of Rome, and it has been represented, and rightly represented, that this is S. Cyprian's doctrine.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Wilberforce sets himself to grapple with both these statements. 'Another expedient has been devised for neutralizing any peculiar claim which the Bishops of Rome might derive from S. Peter's commission—the assertion, namely, that all Bishops are equally his successors. The notion mentioned above was, that his successors at Rome inherited nothing but his ordinary commission as an Apostle: this would imply that his office of Primate was bequeathed to the whole Episcopate' (p. 138). It would imply no such thing, nor did those to whom Mr. Wilberforce attributes the 'devising' of 'the expedient' ever say so. They acknowledged no *office* of Primate; no *peculiar* commission to S. Peter. They regarded S. Peter as at one moment representing his brother Apostles exactly as Cornelius at one moment represented his brother Gentiles. All the successors of the Apostles, therefore, may be said to have succeeded to S. Peter, not in his 'Primatial office,' but in the episcopate, which they inherit from the Apostles, of whom S. Peter was then the representative. In opposition to this view, Mr. Wilberforce cites S. Cyprian's statement, that the foundations were laid in one 'to manifest unity'—that the Church might be *set before us as one*.<sup>2</sup> This Mr. Wilberforce says must mean 'to maintain unity,' and that 'some method' was instituted 'by which the Apostles themselves might be exempted from division.' We have already pointed out this confusion of *manifesting* and *maintaining*, whereby a *lesson* is changed into an *instrument*; we therefore need no longer dwell upon it. But, continues Mr. Wilberforce, 'the other interpretation does not accord with the language of other writers who carried on S. Cyprian's argument.' Who are these 'other writers'? [S.] Optatus and S. Jerome. Can anything

<sup>1</sup> By the Editors of the 'Library of the Fathers.'

be purer eclecticism than to choose one noted passage of Optatus, and half of a passage of S. Jerome, and make them specimens of 'other writers,' whereas they are not specimens of others, when too the rest of the sentence in S. Jerome gives an entirely different complexion to his words, and internal evidence shows the passage from Optatus to be a forgery? Why were not S. Augustine and S. Pacian cited? They were the real inheritors of Cyprianism, and we have already shown that their teaching does accord with the interpretation of 'manifest' which we require; viz. that it means 'manifest,' and not something else. 'In vain' says Mr. Allies, 'does Mr. Thompson try to torture a passage or two of S. Cyprian into his view: 'in vain by resting exclusively on one or two expressions of [S.] Optatus and others, and putting out of sight all that on the other side the Church did and spoke, does he try to give 'it the witness of antiquity' (Pref. p. xiii).

We have already shown how Optatus attained his name of *Saint*, and pointed out that Mr. Wilberforce has quoted a passage, from the forged seventh book, as though it had been genuine. This passage, which he now brings forward, or at least a part of it, is likewise forged; for in it Optatus is made to speak of Siricius as being Bishop of Rome, whereas Siricius did not become Pope till the year 384, and Optatus wrote in the year 370. We will, however, examine it, as though it were not forged. Optatus then, or the person who has borrowed his name, was writing against the Donatists. The Donatists had become schismatical, mainly from dwelling with overstrained earnestness upon one of the attributes of the Church. The Church they argued is holy: where, therefore, holiness is not, that cannot be the Church. Their adversaries, as was natural and right, dwelt upon the other two chief attributes of the Church—Unity and Catholicity. On the latter of these they used the same arguments against the Donatists which we are able to bring with so much force against the exclusiveness of the Roman portion of the Church now. Many of the arguments of Bishop Andrewes against Romanists are almost identical with those of Optatus against Donatists. On the former, they were led by their circumstances to look about them, to see if they could not find some tangible test by which with one argument they might close the mouths of their opponents. To persons in such a state of mind there might well have occurred the thought, that union with the great Western Patriarch would serve as such a test. He was on their side, and had earned the character of orthodoxy, and they could not then contemplate that the war for Truth's sake would ever turn against him who was now their champion. So they were disposed to urge the authority of

Rome, and to magnify his office by magnifying that of S. Peter. This was not done by the great and far-seeing minds of such as S. Augustine; but with lesser minds it is always a temptation to grasp at an argument which gives a momentary advantage over an adversary, without probing its truth to the quick, or looking to its consequences. There seems to be a tendency in that direction in this book against the Donatists. In the passage before us the writer is counting up the prerogatives of the orthodox Church in reply to his Donatist friend. 'There are,' he says, besides the Church's 'limbs and bowels,' 'which are without doubt in the sacraments and in the names of the Trinity' (ii. 10), five 'endowments,' *dotes*, which Mr. Wilberforce calls 'tokens.' These are (1) a chair, (2) an angel (or a ring), (3) the Spirit, (4) a fountain, (5) a seal. A sixth had been added; viz. (6) a navel; but this he denies to be one of the endowments. He then explains the chair:—

'You cannot deny that in the city of Rome on Peter first an episcopal chair was bestowed, in which sat Peter the head of all the Apostles, whence also he was called *Cephas*; in which one chair unity might be preserved by all, that the rest of the Apostles might not each maintain individual chairs, but that he might be at once schismatical and a sinner who set up another against this one chair. In the one chair, then, which is the first of the endowments, (not 'the first of tokens,') sat Peter first, to whom succeeded Linus, &c.; and to Damasus, Siricius, who is now our colleague, together with whom the whole world is joined with us in one fellowship of communion by the interchange of Letters of Communion. And now give an account of the origin of your chair, who wish to claim the holy Church to yourselves.'—*S. Opt.* ii. 2.

This is the one passage in all antiquity which comes nearest to what Mr. Wilberforce requires. We have to remark upon it, 1. that the writer is, as may be seen, very mystical, and his meaning is not easy to discover. 2. That he is also far from a learned man, for he derives *Cephas* from *κεφαλή*, or *caput*, (a derivation which Dupin justly calls 'of little solidity,' and Mr. Wilberforce, in quoting the passage p. 164, wisely omits, without, however, marking that he has done so). 3. That it is but a clumsy forgery, Siricius being fourteen years after the date of Optatus. 4. That the writer does not give a hint that he conceived S. Peter to be the special representative of his Master, and in that sense the centre of unity. But he does seem to consider that S. Peter had an office for the sake of preserving unity among the Apostles. And he and S. Jerome (as quoted below) were the only writers of antiquity that held even that.

S. Jerome is comparing the excellences of S. Peter and S. John—

'But you say that upon Peter the Church was founded, though that same thing was done in another place upon all the Apostles, and all of them receive

the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the Church is founded upon them equally with him; still, one is therefore chosen among the twelve, that by the appointment of a head occasion of schism may be taken away. But why was not John chosen, who was a virgin? Deference was paid to age, because Peter was the elder. Peter was an Apostle, and John was an Apostle, the first married, the second a virgin. But Peter was nothing else than an Apostle (*Apostolus tantum*); John was both an Apostle, and an Evangelist, and a Prophet, &c.—*Adv. Jov. i. p. 168.*

There were, then, two writers in antiquity, Optatus (supposing that only a part, and not the whole, of the passage given above is forged) and S. Jerome, who apparently believed not only that S. Peter was prominent or chief amongst the Apostles, which is a very general view, but also that S. Peter had the office of head of the college for the sake of preserving unity among the Apostles. Grotius has maintained the same view, showing that it does not imply any very lofty idea of S. Peter's prerogative. But while Optatus and S. Jerome use this language, the first nowhere says, and the second distinctly denies, that he held this office as special representative of his Lord. Therefore their testimony is valueless to Mr. Wilberforce. It is this circumstance which would raise him to the position which none but his Master ought to fill, and where the Church of Rome and Mr. Wilberforce would fain place him.<sup>1</sup>

But further, 'S. Cyprian applies the term, the *place of Peter*, especially to the see of Rome' (p. 129). Doubtless. Constantine was Emperor of the Romans, consequently all after Emperors of the Romans were his successors: but Constantine might, if we chose, be looked upon as the symbol of Christian princes in general, then all Christian princes would be his successors. So S. Cyprian regarded Cornelius as the successor of S. Peter in one sense, and all Bishops as his successors in another.

The chapter that speaks of the Bishops of Rome as being S. Peter's successors, ends with two quotations from S. Augustine. In these quotations S. Augustine distinctly affirms, that the Roman Bishop contemporary with himself was S. Peter's successor. But did he mean in the local episcopate of Rome, or in the Primacy? If he meant the first, the passages are wholly irrelevant to the question in hand, and should not have been made use of. Did he, then, mean the Primacy—this vicarial Primacy, by virtue of which the Primate is the peculiar representative of Christ, and the instrument of securing unity

<sup>1</sup> S. Jerome is also quoted by Mr. Wilberforce, in p. 99, as 'noticing' that 'S. Peter's temporary occupation of the See of Antioch, was 'the ground of its superiority.' The passage to which he gives a reference as his authority for this statement, is the following: 'Finally we have received that Peter was the first Bishop of the Church of Antioch, and was thence translated to Rome; which Luke has altogether omitted.'—Vol. iv. p. 244.

to the Church? The words almost immediately following the passage extracted are as follows: 'But suppose that some *traditor* had during this time crept into the line of Bishops which is drawn from Peter himself to Anastasius who now holds the same chair, yet no harm could have been done to the Church, and innocent Christians, whom the Lord has cared for by saying about bad rulers, "Do what they say, but do not what they do, for they say and do not:" that the hope of the faithful may be sure, which by being placed not in man but in the Lord can never be dissipated by the storm of impious schism.'<sup>1</sup> But if he had believed each one of these Bishops to be the peculiar representative of Christ, with whom to be in unity was to be in unity with Christ, he must have conceived that considerable harm would have come to the Church by his being a *traditor*. Look at the different way in which the supporters of the Papacy speak now: 'Christianity rests entirely upon the sovereign pontiff.' 'The sovereign pontiff is the necessary, only, and exclusive foundation of Christianity. To him belong the promises, with him disappears unity, that is, the Church,' is the doctrine of De Maistre. S. Augustine is enumerating in both passages those who succeeded in the local see of Rome as Bishops: there is not a hint of Primacy of any kind. In the last passage *commendavit* is not *committed*, and *episcopatum* is not *pontiff*.

Mr. Wilberforce has brought himself into a difficulty, by trying to grasp at the same time the advantages of two theories, that of development, and that of a direct commission establishing S. Peter and his successors Primates of the Church. A bold theorist might plausibly account for the insignificance of the early Bishops of Rome on the first of these theories, arguing that the Papacy had not yet grown up. Accordingly, Mr. Wilberforce has recourse to this theory (pp. 144—147). But it is irreconcilable with the other theory of a direct commission; for had that commission been really granted, the early Church must have known it, and must have regarded the Bishop of Rome accordingly; whereas, Mr. Wilberforce is driven to the theory of development to account for the fact that they did *not* do so. 'The Church,' he says, 'was as yet like a human body in its infant state; it had received its organization, in which powers lay dormant which at a later period were to awaken into life. As it would be unreasonable, then, to doubt that a child possesses the capacity of reason because it does not as yet give utterance to its thoughts, so the Church may have had a centre of unity, though as yet there was nothing to call out its services, and manifest its effect' (p. 144).

<sup>1</sup> S. Aug. Ep. liii. 3.



Of course it is open to a controversialist to argue thus: but if he does so, he must give up the theory of a direct commission. The Church could not, like the infant, have been unconscious of its centre of unity, had Christ instituted that centre of unity in Matt. xvi. 16.

We should but be wasting our space were we to follow Mr. Wilberforce in his 'historical evidence' for the existence of this centre of unity in early times. He refers to the twice-told tale of S. Polycarp and Anicetus, of Polycrates and Victor, of S. Cyprian and Stephen, S. Dionysius of Alexandria and his namesake of Rome, Paul of Samosata and the Emperor Aurelian. It is simply wearisome to go over these cases again: they have been shown so often and so incontrovertibly to be not only incapable of supporting Mr. Wilberforce's view of the Primacy, but to be irreconcilable with it. No new light is thrown upon them: they are simply reproduced, one side of them being held up to view, while the other is thrown into the shade. We are told that S. Polycarp came to Rome to discuss the question of Easter with Anicetus. We are not told that the interview exhibits perfect equality of power and honour in the two Bishops. We are told that 'S. Irenæus entreated Victor that he would not take any harsh step,' &c. Eusebius says that he gave him advice, παραίνεῖ, and that he was one of those πληκτικώτερον καθαπτομένοι του Βίκτορος, desiring him to be at peace and unity, and in love with his neighbours, while 'he was trying (πειράται,) to cut off the Asiatic dioceses from the common unity,'—an attempt in which he signally failed.

S. Cyprian's words and acts in the question of Re-baptism, as well as S. Firmilian's, we have already seen.' In spite of them, Mr. Wilberforce says, 'It is remarkable that neither Dionysius, Cyprian, nor Firmilian, assert that S. Stephen had no right to interfere, though, by Firmilian especially, he is spoken of with great harshness' (p. 153). If Mr. Wilberforce means, that they did not make use of the words, 'You have no right to interfere,' his assertion is perfectly true, but if he means to say, that they did not deny his right of interference, it is equally untrue. It was his interference that called forth from S. Firmilian the 'harsh' expressions which we have given above; and we have seen S. Cyprian at the head of his council, vindicating the independence of Bishops, with especial regard

<sup>1</sup> The passage in S. Dionysius' letter to Sixtus II., which Mr. Wilberforce translates, 'I wrote to him (Stephen), making intercession for all these men,' is, *περὶ τούτων αὐτοῦ πάντων δεόμενος*; i.e. probably, 'requesting him about all these things.' It is possible that it may mean, 'about all these persons;' but that *δεόμενος περὶ* should mean 'making intercession for,' is impossible; the 'request' conveyed is, that Stephen would behave with greater moderation and Christian forbearance.—Euseb. vii. 5.

to the Bishop of Rome, in 'steady and disdainful repudiation of 'his authority.'<sup>1</sup>

'The presbyters of S. Dionysius of Alexandria having complained of his doctrine to S. Dionysius of Rome,' is no more an indication of the peculiar right of interference which lay in the Pope of Rome (p. 159), than 'the references made 'by Novatian to Alexandria, in his opposition to Cornelius, 'Bishop of Rome' (p. 96,) bear an indication of the peculiar right of interference which lay in the Pope of Alexandria. And it is contrary to historical testimony, to say that Rome alone thus interfered. We have seen that S. Cyprian interfered in Spain, to the extent of cancelling the previous interferences of the Roman Patriarch, *and in Rome itself, for the purpose of preserving the unity of the Church.* Mr. Wilberforce himself tells us (when trying to show the necessity of a Supremacy), that 'in the year 403, Theophilus, Bishop 'of Alexandria, goes to Constantinople with a number of 'Egyptian bishops, holds a synod in a church in the suburbs, 'and deposes S. Chrysostom, the Patriarch of that city' (p. 101), that 'the Oriental bishops complain that S. Athanasius, on 'his way back from his exile at Treves, overthrew the Church's 'order through his whole journey, and restored condemned 'Bishops' (*Ibid.*), that 'S. Chrysostom deposed thirteen Bishops, 'and appointed new ones, where he seems to have had no 'regular jurisdiction' (*Ibid.*). Then it is idle to assert, 'that 'whereas in every other case affairs were settled in the province where they arose, there was *one* Church and *one* line of 'Bishops, which interfered or was consulted, respecting every 'matter of internal disagreement which arose during the first 'three centuries' (p. 156). The truth is, that all the great sees had an undefined right of interfering one with the other when occasion called.

With regard to Paul of Samosata, which shows the greatest spiritual power; to depose a Patriarch, which was what the Eastern Bishops did without any communication with Rome; or to be appointed, as the Bishop of Rome was, by a heathen Emperor, as one of a board, consisting of the Bishops of both the districts of Italy, to settle whether the deposed Patriarch should keep a see-house or not?

'Other circumstances might be added,' continues Mr. Wilberforce, "as showing how completely this See formed the middle point of communication to the Church Catholic. The Montanists, from Phrygia, came to Rome to gain the countenance of its Bishop; Praxeas, from Africa, attempted the like, and for a while was successful. Meantime the Churches of Gaul felt especial interest in the Montanist movement in Asia Minor, and therefore

<sup>1</sup> Milman, vol. i. p. 84.

"send an embassy to Eleutherus, the then Bishop of Rome, about the peace of the Churches" (Euseb. v. 3). About the same time, Soter, Bishop of Rome, sends alms, according to the custom of his Church, to the Churches throughout the empire, and in the words of Eusebius, "affectionately exhorted them who came to Rome as a father his children." One of the charges made by Hippolytus against Callistus is, that the laxity which had been originally introduced by him, enabled Bishops who had been guilty of deadly sin to escape deposition; and about thirty years afterwards, Basilides, who had been deposed from his Bishopric in Spain, goes to Rome to procure his restoration from S. Stephen.—P. 159.

Four points are here noticed, on each of which we have a few remarks to make. 1. The Montanists came to Rome. This may be paralleled by Achilli's coming to London; but what does it prove? Having mentioned their presence, Mr. Wilberforce should not have failed to inform us likewise that they made a convert for a time of Pope Eleutherus. 2. Praxeas came to Rome. Yes: and he bewildered Pope Victor, threw Pope Zephyrinus into a sea of theological difficulties, out of which he never emerged, and converted Pope Callistus to a heresy for which he was excommunicated by S. Hippolytus. 3. 'The Churches of Gaul send an embassy to Eleutherus, the then Bishop of Rome, about the peace of the Churches' (Euseb. v. 3). This is a mistranslation and a misstatement. Eusebius's words are, 'There being a difference of opinion on this point' (the alleged prophetic powers of the Montanists), 'the brethren in Gaul give their own pious and most orthodox judgment about it, and also publish several letters of the martyrs who had been perfected amongst them, *which letters they* (the martyrs) *had written while they were still in bonds to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia, and also to Eleutherus, the then Bishop of Rome, treating* (πρεσβεύοντες) *about the peace of the Churches.*' Therefore no embassy was sent at all; it was the martyrs, not the Churches, who wrote: the letters were sent to the Asiatics and Phrygians, as well as to Rome: and, as Valesius has pointed out, the probable reason for writing specially to Eleutherus was, that he had himself become a Montanist, and in Tertullian's words, 'acknowledged the prophecies of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and in consequence of that acknowledgment, offered peace to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia.'

4. 'Soter sends alms, and affectionately exhorts them who came to Rome, as a father his children.' A liberal and a gentle-hearted Bishop! What then? 5. 'One of the charges made by Hippolytus against Callistus is, that the laxity which had been originally introduced by him enabled Bishops who had been guilty of deadly sin to escape deposition.' And what if he did charge that wicked man with setting an example

of iniquity which was likely to destroy good morals and good discipline? What follows? And why should this one 'charge' be selected, while no notice is taken of the other charges which S. Hippolytus brings against him, such as his being an heresiarch? 6. 'Basilides, who had been deposed from his Bishopric 'in Spain, goes to Rome to procure his restoration from S. 'Stephen.' And this is all that Mr. Wilberforce has to say of Basilides! Not one word to inform us that Stephen did attempt his restoration, and that his interference was ignominiously rejected, and the Roman Patriarch's authority superseded by that of the Primate of Africa.

These cases, apposite as we have seen them to be, from Anicetus down to Stephen, are literally all that Mr. Wilberforce has to bring forward in proof of that Primacy which made the Bishop of Rome to be, by Divine commission, the representative of Christ, and the centre of unity to the Church. Let it be steadily kept in mind that *that* is the Primacy which Mr. Wilberforce's argument requires, and not a mere prominence; and it is clear at once that he has nothing to support him. That there is a certain prominence in the Bishops of Rome, is true; and how could it be otherwise, when they were seated in the heart and centre of Christendom, 'the middle point of communication to the world,' upon the rock of the ancient Capitol? Mr. Wilberforce seems to feel that this is a perfectly adequate cause for such preeminence as they enjoyed:—

'It is a more plausible notion that the temporal greatness of the metropolis gradually gave an ascendancy to its spiritual ruler; and, that the Bishops of Rome are not the successors of Peter, but the heirs of the Cæsars. Such an idea naturally finds acceptance with them who suppose that the Church is a mere human institution, and that it owes its organization to worldly policy. And this seems to be the real point on which the question turns. If men suppose that the complicated arrangements of the Hierarchy, which rose up during the first three centuries after Christ, were a mere scheme of human contrivance; if they attribute them to the ambition of priests, and the ignorance of the people, or even to the sagacious combination of worldly men, no doubt they will assign the same origin to that central power in which they culminated.'—P. 160.

And again:—

'It is natural that those who suppose, like Hobbes, that the Christian scheme was one of worldly policy, should imagine that the authority of the Bishops of Rome was deduced merely from the influence of their city. Such, however, was not the belief of Christians in early times.'—P. 164.

Are the Second and Fourth Œcumenical Councils 'like Hobbes?' Did they count 'the Church a mere human organization?' Did they 'attribute the arrangements of the hierarchy to the ambition of priests, &c. &c.?' Or, are they the exponents of 'the belief of Christians in early times?' We believe that Mr. Wilberforce will acknowledge them to be the latter, and not

the former. But it is these very Second and Fourth Œcumenical Councils which tell us distinctly, and in so many words, that it *was* because Rome was the imperial city that it had its ecclesiastical privileges. The Twenty-eighth Canon of the Council of Chalcedon runs as follows:—

‘We, following in all things the decision of the holy fathers, and acknowledging the canon of the one hundred and fifty most religious Bishops which has just been read, [*i.e.* the third canon of the Council of Constantinople,] do also determine and decree the same thing respecting the prerogatives of the most holy city of Constantinople, New Rome. For the fathers properly have granted its prerogatives to the throne of the Elder Rome, because that was the imperial city.<sup>1</sup> And the one hundred and fifty most religious Bishops, being moved with the same intention, gave equal prerogatives to the most holy throne of New Rome, judging with reason, that the city which was honoured with the sovereignty and the senate, and which enjoyed equal prerogatives with the Elder royal Rome, should also be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters, being the second city after her.’—*Papal Supremacy*, &c. pp. 24, 75.

It *was* then ‘the belief of Christians in early times’—it is the recorded testimony of the Church Universal assembled in council—that Rome’s position as the seat of empire was the cause of her ecclesiastical preeminence. It is idle, consequently, for Mr. Wilberforce to attempt to browbeat us by telling us that we are ‘like Hobbes,’ because we hold what the Primitive Church held. He insinuates that men must have reached a very low moral and spiritual state, before they can do that. Rather, he says, ‘they will accept S. Cyprian’s statement, that the see of Rome ‘is “the principal Church,” “the root and mother of the Church Catholic,” *because it is* “the seat of Peter, whence the unity of ‘the priesthood had its origin” (p. 164). That S. Cyprian ever did say that the Church of Rome was ‘the root and mother of the Church Catholic,’ we have already shown to be doubly untrue. But supposing that he had, still would it be of any use to continue to argue with an ‘Inquirer’ who takes two passages from two different letters of S. Cyprian, two passages which have nothing whatever to do with each other, and unites them with a *because*, so as to make the second the reason of the first, when the very point which he has to prove is, that the thing asserted in the first is the consequence of the second?

We submit that Mr. Wilberforce has not proved that any peculiar commission was transferred from S. Peter to the Bishops of Rome, whereby they became special representatives of Christ, and the head and centre of unity to the early Church; but that the statement that they held any such place, and occupied any such office, is a statement unfounded in history, and against which the voice of history protests.

<sup>1</sup> Translated by Mr. Wilberforce, ‘because that city ruled.’—p. 191.

III. The next thing is to bridge over the gulf from the Primacy to the Supremacy. The following is Mr. Wilberforce's attempt:—

'Admitting that the successor of S. Peter possessed a Primacy, how does this involve a Supremacy of the Pope? The Pope's Supremacy consists of three principal particulars, which either include or involve the most important rights which have been claimed by his supporters. 1st. The right of finally deciding ecclesiastical causes. 2ndly. The right of presiding over Councils. 3rdly. The right of interfering in ecclesiastical appointments. Are these rights inherent in the Primacy? For if this could be shown, the Supremacy would appear to be only another name for the Primacy, and the proof which has been given of the early existence of the one, would demonstrate the antiquity of the other.'—P. 168.

The test is not sufficient, and the test breaks down. It is not sufficient: for the right of finally deciding causes, of presiding over councils, and of interfering in ecclesiastical causes, might all exist in one person, and yet it need not follow that 'all authority resided' in him, 'and from him was derived to the rest,' which is Bellarmine's account of the constitution of the Church under the Supremacy;<sup>1</sup> nor need it follow that 'the Church was 'a pure monarchy, so much so, that if in an Œcumenical Council 'the greater part of the Fathers agreed with the Pope, all would 'be well, and settled by common consent; but if they disagreed, 'the Fathers' authority would have no force, because in separating from their head they cannot represent the Church,' which is the declaration of the Canonists.<sup>2</sup> And, moreover, we might ask by what rule of eclecticism it was, that, whereas the Canon Law orders equally, 'First, that Councils should be called by the Roman pontiff; and, secondly, that he should preside over them;' the former requisite should be omitted, and the latter only retained.

But let us suppose that the test was sufficient. Did the right, then, of finally deciding ecclesiastical causes *inhere in the Primacy*? i.e. had the Bishop of Rome the right of decision in a sense in which no other Patriarch had it, by virtue of his being 'Primate of the Church?'<sup>3</sup> On the contrary, S. Cyprian exercised the right with a higher hand. The only 'references' to the Patriarch of Rome which Mr. Wilberforce is able to enumerate before the time of Julius and the Council of Sardica, are 'the reference 'to S. Stephen against Marcian of Arles, and to S. Dionysius

<sup>1</sup> De Pont. Rom. 4, 24.

<sup>2</sup> Devoti, Inst. Canon. Prol. c. ii. Papal Supremacy, &c. p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Dev. Prol. 3, § 38.

That it should be as Primate of the Church, and not as Patriarch or Bishop of Rome, that he had this right, is absolutely necessary for Mr. Wilberforce's argument. Anything which grew out of the office which the Bishop of Rome held in common with his brother Patriarchs, cannot arise from the peculiar and direct commission on which he rests the Papal power.



'against his namesake at Alexandria' (p. 177); the first is more than paralleled by the reference to S. Cyprian against the same Marcian of Arles, and S. Cyprian's declaration, that it was therefore the business of *himself* and Stephen to remedy that which was complained of;<sup>1</sup> and the latter we can only compare with some discontented letters which sometimes find their way to England, complaining that some Colonial Bishop does or does not hold some doctrine.

Such complaints were made from everywhere to everywhere, when occasion arose. Casaubon, in his masterly explanation of this point, names the following who interfered in matters beyond their immediate jurisdiction for the sake of redressing evils: Eusebius of Samosata, in Syria; Lucifer of Cagliari, at Antioch; Hosius, Gregory Nyssen, Eusebius of Vercelli, Epiphanius of Salamina, in many provinces; S. Cyprian, at Rome, at Arles, in Spain; S. Hilary, at Milan; S. Athanasius, at Antioch; S. Cyril of Alexandria, at Constantinople; and he points out the principle on which these acts took place, viz. that every Bishop was bound to care for the whole Church, and all was done *ἀγαπητικῶς*.<sup>2</sup>

In the Council of Sardica, which Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges to have 'laid down a *new principle of appeal*,' A.D. 347, 'the appellate jurisdiction of the Pope,' we are told, 'received its first canonical expression' (p. 176). We give the canon in its Greek and its Latin form, as it appears most likely that both were used at the Council.

'Bishop Hosius said: This too we must add, that no Bishop is to go across the borders from his own province to another where there are Bishops, unless he is called in by his brethren, that we may not seem to close the doors of charity. And this too in like manner we must provide, that if in any province one of the Bishops has a matter against his brother and fellow Bishop, neither of the two shall call in Bishops from another province as further judges. If a Bishop thinks that he has been condemned, and suppose that he has a good cause for the judgment to be renewed; if it seem good to your charity, let us honour the memory of the Apostle Peter, and let those who have given the decision, write to Julius, the Bishop of Rome, so that the court may be renewed, if proper, by the Bishops who are neighbouring to the province, and let him appoint other judges himself; but if it cannot be proved that his case is such as to require a second trial, let not that which has once been determined be changed, but let the sentence which has been passed stand good.'—*Mansi*, tom. iii. p. 8. *Papal Supremacy*, &c. p. 28.

The first part of the Latin canon is the same as the Greek; we, therefore, give only the latter part where it differs:—

'But if any one of the Bishops has been judged in any cause, and thinks that he has a good case for the council being renewed, if it please you, let us

<sup>1</sup> 'Cui rei nostrum est consulere et subvenire, frater carissime,' &c. Ep. 67 ad Steph.

<sup>2</sup> See Casaubon's *Treatise De Libertate Ecclesiastica*, translated and published in *Hickes' Treatises*, vol. iii. p. 87. Ang. Cath. Lib.

honour the memory of S. Peter the Apostle, that those who have tried the cause write to Julius, the Roman Bishop, and if he judges that the trial ought to be renewed, let it be renewed, and let him give judges. But if he determines that the cause is such, that what is done ought not to be retouched, what he has decreed shall be confirmed. Is this the opinion of all? The Synod replied, It is.'—*Mansi*, tom. iii. p. 23.

There is some difference, it will be seen, in these versions; they agree, however, in one clause—'*If it seems good to your charity*'—'*if it please you*.' It does not acknowledge any right whatever inhering in the Bishop of Rome, as Primate, to receive appeals: it makes a concession to the effect that the Bishops, for whom it was legislating (this was a purely Western Council), might by grant of the Council, if the Council willed, be allowed to appeal to Julius, Bishop of Rome, if they thought themselves wronged in a trial; and it grants to Julius, Bishop of Rome, the power of desiring that the cause may be reheard in the province where it arose, if there is sufficient reason. The words—'*if it seems good to your charity*'—'*if it please you*'—are clearly very important words. And they have been dwelt upon at great length by the whole school of Gallican divines, such as De Marca,<sup>1</sup> as well as by Casaubon and our own writers. How, then, does Mr. Wilberforce meet them? What explanation has he to give?—what does he do with them?—*He omits them!* Here is the canon in his version:—

'If a Bishop is judged in any cause, and thinks that he has reason for demanding a new trial, let us honour the memory of S. Peter the Apostle; let them who have examined the cause, write to Julius, the Bishop of Rome, and if he thinks that the trial ought to be repeated, let it be repeated, and let him assign judges.'—P. 176.

This is a simple way of meeting the difficulty; but why stop short with *omissions*?—why not invent a clause as well as leave one out?

With the Sardican decree Mr. Wilberforce is quite satisfied. 'Such was the manner in which the appellate jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome received a legal shape' (p. 177). He does not tell us that the canon is irreconcilable with appeals having been made to Rome by Divine right, or by virtue of the Nicene canons, nor that the canon was reversed in the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon. The appellate power which, for the West, but never for the East, became vested in the Bishops of Rome, arose, far more, from a decree of the Emperor Gratian in 378: it was increased by a decree of the Emperor Valentinian in 445 (those 'strong-handed associates

<sup>1</sup> 'The words of the canon prove that the institution of this right was new. *If it please you*, says Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, who presided, *let us honour the memory of the Apostle S. Peter*. He says not that the ancient tradition was to be confirmed, as was wont to be done in matters which only require the renewal or explanation of an ancient right.'—*De Concord*. vii. 3; *Papal Supremacy*, &c. p. 29.

(p. 277) who backed' the Roman Bishops), and it was finally confirmed by the false Decretals of Isidore, which were forged in the middle of the ninth century. Mr. Wilberforce does not quote one of the canons of the Œcumenical Councils on the subject of appeals; and yet there are many. For example, the sixth canon of the Council of Constantinople in 381, adopting the rule laid down by the Council of Antioch in 341, orders that a Bishop, against whom a charge is laid, shall be judged by his coprovincial Bishops, and that from them there should be an appeal to the Bishops of the 'Diocese'—*i. e.* of the country in which the province was situated, but that the appeal is to go no further. And if the Sardican canon 'legalizes the appellate jurisdiction' of the Bishop of Rome, what does the ninth canon of Chalcedon do for the Bishop of Constantinople?

'If a clergyman has a matter against his own or another Bishop, let him be judged by the synod of the province, but if a Bishop or clergyman has a case against the metropolitan of the province, let him take either the Exarch of the "Diocese," or the [episcopal] throne of royal Constantinople, and be judged there.'—*Papal Supremacy, &c.* p. 74.

This canon of the fourth Œcumenical Council, which in matter of appeal appoints the Patriarch of Constantinople as Primate of the Church, is never once mentioned by Mr. Wilberforce. Dupin's account of the authority of the Sardican Council is as follows:—

'Those canons of Sardica have never been received in the East,<sup>2</sup> and only at a late date in the West. As to the East, it is well known that, at the very moment they were being passed, the Eastern Bishops established the very contrary; nor afterwards did they make mention of this right of revising judgments in the Councils of Constantinople, or Chalcedon, or in Trullo, and they there decreed that the decision of the provincial synod, or at farthest of the Patriarch, should be final in all causes. And in the West, after this synod was held, the Africans rejected the discipline sanctioned by it, the French rejected it, nay, even the Italians did not admit its authority.'—*Dupin, Diss. Eccles. ii.* p. 91.

<sup>1</sup> The Exarch of a Diocese was the same thing as a Patriarch or Primate. The Dioceses at this time were, as is rightly explained in 'Papal Supremacy,' p. 13, 'civil divisions or districts of the Roman empire, made up of several provinces.' There were thirteen Dioceses—Italy, Egypt, the East (*i. e.* the parts about Antioch), Asia, Pontus, Thrace, Macedonia, Dacia, Illyricum, Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain, (*Ibid.* p. 76.) The chief Bishop in each province was called Metropolitan; the chief Bishop in each Diocese or district was called indifferently, Patriarch, Exarch, or Primate. The name Patriarch was, however, by custom confined to the Bishops of the Dioceses of Italy, Egypt, and the East, and the Bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem. The chief Bishop in most of the other Dioceses was called Exarch, and in Africa had the name of Primate. The Bishops of one Diocese are strictly forbidden (Council of Constantinople, can. ii.) to intermeddle in the affairs of another Diocese. Thus Dioceses, ecclesiastically considered, were independent National Churches.

<sup>2</sup> This is true; for though admitted in the Council in Trullo, they were admitted only in company with other canons enacting the opposite principle of appeal for the East.

In spite of this Western synod, and the decrees of Gratian and Valentinian, Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges that the Roman Patriarch's 'appellate jurisdiction' was not 'fully admitted' till the time of Gregory the Great,—that is, for 600 years of the Church's life; nor was it admitted then. How *could* it have been, when it was allowed by the canons of Chalcedon for any Bishop in the Roman district to appeal to the Bishop of Constantinople, but it was not allowed for a Bishop in the Constantinopolitan district to appeal to the Bishop of Rome, or to any other than the Bishop of Constantinople?—when at that moment the Patriarch of Constantinople was attempting to set himself up as head and centre of the Church, putting forth those very claims which the successors of the Roman Patriarchs have since made their own?—when S. Gregory found it necessary to write his famous letters, broadly denouncing the assumption, by him or by any other, of the titles which embody the present Papal idea, because they were destructive of the Patriarchal system of the authority of Bishops, and of the Faith itself (Lib. 5, 43; 9, 68); because they were profane appellations, anticipatory of Antichrist (Lib. 7, 27, 33); because Christ alone is the Head of the Church, and the term Universal (then assumed by John of Constantinople) was an invasion of his rights, and an imitation of the devil? (Lib. 5, 18). Appeal to Rome was not acknowledged in Gregory's time. It was one of the things which grew out of Isidore's forgeries, according to Bishop De Marca's testimony.<sup>1</sup> And Fleury expresses himself on the subject as follows:—

'It is said in the false Decretals, that Bishops cannot be judged definitively save by the Pope alone, and that principle is often repeated there. Nevertheless, you have seen a hundred examples to the contrary; to take one of the most illustrious, Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, the first See of S. Peter, and the third city of the Roman empire, was judged and deposed by the Bishops of the East and the neighbouring provinces, without the participation of the Pope, whom they contented themselves with informing of it after it was done, as is seen by their synodal letters, and the Pope does not complain of it. Nothing is more frequent in the first nine centuries (*i.e.* until the false Decretals were accepted), than the accusations and depositions of Bishops. But their trial took place in provincial councils, which were the ordinary tribunal for all ecclesiastical causes. One must be absolutely ignorant of the history of the Church, to imagine at any time, or in any country, it has ever been impossible to judge a Bishop without sending to Rome, or obtaining a commission from the Pope. . . . One of the greatest wounds which the false Decretals have inflicted on the discipline of the Church, is the having infinitely extended appeals to the Pope. It appears that the forger had this point greatly at heart, by the care he has taken to diffuse through all his work the principle, that not only every Bishop, but every priest, and in general every person who finds himself harassed, may, on every occasion, appeal directly to the Pope. He

<sup>1</sup> De Concord. vii. 20.

has made as many as nine Popes speak on this subject, Anacletus, the first and second Sixtus, Fabian, Cornelius, Victor, Zephyrinus, Marcellus, and Julius . . . You have seen that all the Greek Bishops, and their Patriarchs even, were judged and often deposed in Councils; that permission was not asked of the Pope to assemble them, nor appeals made to him for their judgments. He was not applied to for the translation of Bishops or the founding of Bishoprics; the canons comprised in the ancient code of the Greek Church were followed. . . . You will say, perhaps, that it is not surprising that the Greeks did not apply to the Pope, either for appeal or for the other matters, since, from the time of Photius, they ceased to recognise him as head of the Church. But did they apply to him before? And in the time when they were most united with the Roman Church, did they observe anything of that which I call the New Discipline? They were not so heedless as to do it, since the Latins themselves did it not, and this discipline was yet unknown to all the Church.—*Fleury, Quatrième Discours.*

So much for the first part of Mr. Wilberforce's test. With the second he fares still worse.

'The second main particular in the Papal Supremacy, is the right of presiding in Councils. How comes this to belong to the Bishops of Rome?'—P. 182.

How, indeed? But perhaps we had better first ask, if it is the fact, before we inquire into the manner of accounting for it. Did the Bishops of Rome preside over the Early Œcumenical Councils? As the elder Patriarch of the Church, we should have expected that they would do so. But what says history? Did S. Peter preside at the Council of Jerusalem? No! Mr. Wilberforce maintains that he did (p. 125). Our readers have the Acts of the Apostles before them, and we leave the question to their judgment. Did the Bishop of Rome preside at Nicæa? No! It is almost certain that Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, the Emperor's favourite Bishop, presided. If he did not, he at any rate ranked above the representatives of the Roman Bishops, for he signs above them.<sup>1</sup>

Did the Bishop of Rome preside at Constantinople? No! The second Œcumenical Council, says Mr. Wilberforce, was 'merely an Eastern Synod.' . . . It was 'presided over therefore by the Bishops of the city where it was held, and the first name subscribed is that of Nectarius of Constantinople' (p. 184). This is not correct. It was presided over by Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, a Patriarch unrecognised by the Patriarch of Rome, and probably at that moment out of communion with him; and it was only upon his death that S. Gregory Nazianzen, and

<sup>1</sup> In the Bishop of Rome being represented by presbyters at Nicæa, Mr. Wilberforce sees something which 'distinguished him from the other prelates': 'the see of Rome, as being the seat of the Primate, had a privilege of her own, independent of anything belonging to the Episcopal office in general' (p. 185). Unfortunately for this theory, Eusebius and Socrates give us the real reason of the presence of the presbyters. 'The prelate of the royal city was away on account of his age, and his presbyters were present, and filled his place.'—*Socr. i. 8.*

Nectarius became successively presidents ('Papal Supremacy,' p. 11). That it should have been 'merely an Eastern Synod,' where Rome was not represented, which fixed the shape of the Nicene Creed, ought, we should imagine, to be some obstacle to the theory of a 'Primacy which involves the Supremacy.'

Did the Bishop of Rome preside at the Council of Ephesus? No! S. Cyril of Alexandria was its president. Thus we see that Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and Alexandria, that is, all the other four Patriarchates had the honour of presiding at the Œcumenical Councils of the Church before the Patriarch of Rome, on whom that office devolved for the first time at the Council of Chalcedon.

But is it found that the Bishops of Rome presided at the non-Œcumenical Councils—those Councils whose canons were taken into the code of the Eastern Church by the Council in Trullo? Did he preside at Ancyra? at Neocæsarea? at Gangra? at Antioch? at Laodicea? at Sardica? at Carthage? No! not at any one of them. Did he preside at any single Council previous to the Council of Chalcedon, except such as were held in his own Diocese or Patriarchate? No! not at one. And yet, 'the right of presiding at Councils is inherent in the Primacy' (p. 168).

Mr. Wilberforce will not, however, give up the Council of Ephesus. 'The president was the second Patriarch, S. Cyril, 'who acted professedly as the representative of the Primate S. Celestine' (p. 184). 'Not only did S. Cyril act as president 'by especial delegation from Pope Celestine, but the Council 'refers to his direction as the ground of its proceeding' (p. 186). The meaning of the last part of this sentence is that 'the Synod wrote to the Emperor, saying, that they had 'deposed Nestorius on finding him guilty of heresy, and that 'they praised Celestine, Bishop of great Rome, who condemned 'Nestorius for his heretical doctrines before our sentence, and 'put out his sentence against him before us for the sake of the 'safety of the Church, and of the holy and saving Faith 'which has been handed down to us from the holy Apostles 'and Evangelists, and the holy Fathers.' To us, as to Bossuet, the reconsideration of a sentence passed by the Roman Patriarch (a similar sentence had been passed by the Alexandrian Patriarch), shows rather a want than an abundance of authority on his part. But it is with the presidency that we have now especially to deal. Mr. Wilberforce has added a very telling note:

"*Vicem nostram Cyrillo delegavimus,*" &c. Harduin, i. 1318, 1307, 1466.—The commission to S. Cyril himself is given, Harduin, i. 1323, and is referred to by the Egyptian Bishops, 1355, 1475.—P. 186.



Unfortunate, that when we turn to Harduin, we find that 'the commission' referred to has nothing whatever to do with the Council of Ephesus, that the letter containing it was written on the 10th of August, A.D. 430, and that the act which S. Cyril is thereby authorized to perform is to be performed after the expiration of ten days, whereas the Council of Ephesus was not summoned till the 20th of December, that is, more than four months afterwards, and did not sit till the 22d of June, 431. At the time that S. Celestine wrote his letter, the proposal of an Œcumenical Council was not broached. The facts are these. Nestorius and S. Cyril, the two great Patriarchs of the East, being locked in internecine strife, turned for help to the Patriarch of the West. They both wrote to S. Celestine. S. Celestine took the side of S. Cyril and orthodoxy, and followed his lead in the Nestorian controversy just as Julius clung fast to S. Athanasius in the Arian disputes. A Roman Council was held, which resulted in the condemnation of Nestorius by the Roman Church. Upon this Celestine writes to S. Cyril, Aug. 10, 430, the letter which, according to Mr. Wilberforce, appoints him to 'act as president at the Council of Ephesus by especial delegation from Pope Celestine' (at a time when the Council of Ephesus had not yet been heard of), and contains his 'commission' for that purpose. It runs as follows:—

'Join therefore the authority of our See to your own; use our stead; execute this sentence with strictness and vigour: let him either, within ten days from the day of this monition, condemn in writing his wicked teaching, and declare that he holds that faith about the nativity of Christ, our God, which is held both by the Roman Church and by your Holiness' Church, and by the whole of our religion; or if he does not do this, let your Holiness provide at once for his Church, and let him know that he must needs be cut off from our body, since he has been unwilling to receive the treatment of his physicians, and like a pestilent disease, has rushed violently to the destruction of himself and of all entrusted to him. We have written to the same effect to our ho'y brethren and brother Bishops, John (of Antioch); Rufus (of Thessalonica); Juvenal (of Jerusalem); and Flavian (of Philippi), in order that our sentence, or rather the Divine sentence of Christ, may be known about him. Aug. 10, 430.—Harduin, i. 1323.

S. Cyril, like S. Celestine, held his Council at Alexandria, and then despatched his celebrated letter of excommunication, written not only in his own name, but also by authority of the above 'commission,' in that of S. Celestine. This excommunication was conveyed to Constantinople by four Bishops, and there published Dec. 6, A.D. 430. Nestorius met it with like anathemas against his opponents; and then, to allay the storm, Theodosius called the Council of Ephesus; the sentences of Celestine and Cyril, meantime, remaining without effect, as they awaited the superior authority of a General Council.

So much for the *Vicem nostram Cyrillo delegavimus*, and the Com-

mission to S. Cyril, which, we repeat, was given for one thing, and is represented by Mr. Wilberforce to have been given for another. But we are told further, that 'it is referred to by the Egyptian Bishops.' The fact indicated by these words is, that the chief notary, who was Peter, an Alexandrian presbyter, read the list of the Bishops who were present at the opening of the Council; and the list begins thus:—'The most religious and pious Bishops, 'Cyril of Alexandria, who was *also* managing the part (*διέπροντος καὶ τὸν τόπον*) of Celestine, the most holy and pious Bishop 'of the Church of the Romans, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, and 'Memnon of Ephesus, and Flavian of Philippi, who was holding 'also the part of Rufus, the most pious Bishop of the Church of 'Thessalonica,' &c. This means that Cyril was armed with the authority of the Patriarch of Rome, as well as his own, and held his proxy just as Flavian held that of Rufus. But where is there anything about his presiding by Celestine's commission, and the Egyptian Bishops acknowledging it? Whether or no he presided simply in his own right, or by his own right, strengthened by the addition of the right of Celestine, is a question which we need not discuss. That he presided in his own right is indubitable, and the reason why S. Celestine's name is recorded is, according to Richerius, that the orthodox body might have a majority of the Patriarchs on their side, whereas without him, they were divided two against two. Most justly Mr. Allies says, that S. Cyril sat as president in his own right; and Bossuet's words are sufficiently explicit: 'Although 'Cyril having been named the executor of the Pope's sentence, 'had executed it in the Council,' (he had executed it previously to the Council;) 'yet he had not been expressly delegated to the 'Council, of which Celestine had yet no thought when he trusted Cyril 'to represent him. But Arcadius Projectus and Philip being 'expressly sent by Celestine to the Council, confirmed the acts 'of the Council in virtue of this special commission.'<sup>1</sup> After their arrival, which did not occur at the beginning, these three legates are the *τοποῦρηται* of Celestine and the Western Bishops, and accordingly Arcadius subscribes next after Cyril, who signs first simply in his own character, *i.e.* because he was Patriarch of Alexandria, and President of the Council. The difference between the commission to S. Cyril, previous to the time that the Council was thought of, and of the commission to Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip for the Council, is distinctly stated in the letter of the Synod to the Emperor.<sup>2</sup> And in the letter of the Synod to Celestine, relating the condemnation of S. Cyril and Memnon, by John of Antioch, the especial reason given why Celestine ought to be *personally* indignant at it, is, not that his representative was condemned, but that

<sup>1</sup> Boss. vii. 9. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Hard. i. p. 1483.

the Synod had been insulted, in which sat Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip, τὴν σὴν ἡμῖν παρουσίαν δι' ἐαυτῶν χαρίζομενοι καὶ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέδρας τὸν τόπον ἀναπληροῦντες.<sup>1</sup>

Richerius, the learned doctor of the Sorbonne, writes clearly and decidedly:—

‘Bellarmine, and the other writers of the Roman Court, plead that Cyril presided because Celestine had made him his vicar. But since the Ephesian Council was held against Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the right of presiding belonged to Cyril of Alexandria, in the absence of the Roman Pontiff; without any commission from Celestine, he would have held that office in right of his own see, according to the Nicene canons. Why, it is evident from the second action, that Celestine sent Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip to take his place in the Council of Ephesus; the acts declare it in so many words, and yet Cyril signed before them in the sixth Action. *Nor should it be concealed that this letter in which Celestine commits his stead to Cyril, was written before he thought that a General Council was going to be held against Nestorius, and is restricted solely to the execution of his sentence against Nestorius, who he desired should be excommunicated and deposed, unless he repented within ten days after the sentence.* From hence it follows, that it is a vain attempt which is made to prove that Cyril presided over the Council of Ephesus as Celestine’s vicar, since that office belonged to him by the prerogative of his own see.”—*Hist. Conc. Gen.* p. 150.

Before leaving the Council of Ephesus, we must give a specimen of how much Mr. Wilberforce can effect by translation, and by a judicious choice of versions: ‘We have directed, according to our solicitude, our holy brethren and fellow priests, men of one mind with us, and well approved, the Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and Philip our presbyter, that they may be present at those things which are done, and carry out that which we have previously appointed; to which, we have no doubt, your Holiness will yield assent, since what is done appears to be decreed for the security of the whole Church’<sup>2</sup> (p. 186). This ought to be translated thus: ‘We have sent to you, as undertaking our solicitude, the holy brethren our fellow ministers, men proved to be of the same soul with ourselves, Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and our presbyter Philip, who will be present at the proceedings, and carry out what was long ago settled upon by us. *We doubt not that your Holiness will accord with them, for whatever conclusion ye shall arrive at would seem to be settled for the sake of the security of all the Churches.*’<sup>3</sup> Mr. Wilberforce has

<sup>1</sup> Hard. i. p. 1510.

<sup>2</sup> Hard. i. p. 1741.

<sup>3</sup> Ἀποστείλαμεν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀναδεχομένους φρόντιδα, τοὺς ἁγίους ἀδελφοὺς καὶ συλλειτουργοὺς ἡμῶν, δημοφύχους ἡμῖν δεδοκιμασμένους Ἀρκάδιον καὶ Προϊεκτον ἐπισκόπους, καὶ Φίλιππον τὸν ἡμετέρον πρεσβύτερον, οἱ τοῖς πραττομένοις παρέσονται καὶ τὰ παρ’ ἡμῖν πάλαι ὁρισθέντα ἐκβιβάσουσιν οἷς πωρασχεθῆναι παρὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγιότητος οὐκ ἀμφιβάλλομεν συγκατάθεσιν, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο ὅπερ ἂν γνῶτε, δοκῇ ὑπὲρ τῆς πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀμεριμίας κεκρίσθαι. There is another reading given in the margin, ἐὰν τὸ πρασσόμενον δοκῇ ὑπὲρ τῆς πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀσφαλείας; i.e. since that which is being done will have seemed to be decreed for the security of all the Churches; and still another, ὅπερ ἀνέγνωτε, δοκεῖ ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ., i.e. that which ye

followed the Latin instead of the Greek text, which was read and approved by the Fathers. There is another version, as follows: 'We have sent Arcadius, &c., who will be present, and will confirm afresh with their vote the things which are constituted by you. And we doubt not that your Holiness will admit them to the common harmony, and the giving of the sentence. And whatever ye shall determine, let that, for the sake of the tranquillity of all the Churches, be settled and defined.' Richerius argues at some length, that this is the genuine reading.<sup>1</sup> The fact of its existence should have been mentioned, and the Greek text ought to have been followed. Nor should it have been concealed that the main work of the Council was done, and the sentence pronounced, before that letter of S. Celestine arrived.

Next, for the Council of Chalcedon:—

'When we come to the Council itself, the four following things appear distinctly: 1st. The Council yields submission to the Pope, in regard to orders which he had previously given to his legates. 2ndly. The Council applies to the Pope to confirm its decisions, and that which is not confirmed by him falls to the ground. 3rdly. It rests the deference paid to the Pope on his claim to represent S. Peter. 4thly. It attributes to the Pope a peculiar personal dignity, so that those who assault him are supposed in an especial manner to assault the Church.'—P. 188.

History asserts the very reverse of all these four propositions. The first is founded on three occurrences: (1.) the deposition of Dioscorus; (2.) the treatment of Leo's letter to Flavian; (3.) the restoration of Theodoret. *These are the very three occurrences which Bossuet brings forward to prove the exact contrary of Mr. Wilberforce's statement, and by which he does prove it triumphantly.* For a full refutation of Mr. Wilberforce we must refer our readers to Bossuet's 'Defence of the Gallican Clergy,' book vii. chap. 15, 17. A translation of his arguments will be found in Mr. Allies' book, 'The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism,' p. 279. We cannot be sufficiently amazed that Mr. Wilberforce should have so ventured to peril his good name (if he was kept back by no other motive) as he has done by his reckless statements with regard to the Council of Chalcedon. His account of the deposition of Dioscorus is as follows:—

'At its first meeting, Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, who had presided at Ephesus two years before, took his place without hesitation as a Bishop. But Paschasinus, the reverend Bishop and vicar of the Apostolic See, said,—“We have the order of the blessed and apostolical Bishop of the city of Rome, the head of all the Churches, in which he has thought meet to order that Dioscorus should not sit in the Synod, but if he attempts to

---

have read, seems to be decreed, &c. Hard. i. p. 1472. There is evidently something corrupt.

<sup>1</sup> Rich. Hist. Conc. Gen. p. 155.

do so should be ejected. To this order we must keep." The reason is given by the other legate: Lucentius, the reverend Bishop who represented the Apostolic See, said, "He must give an account of his own judgment; for he presumed to judge when he had no right, and ventured to hold a Synod without the authority of the Apostolic See, which has never been done, nor ought to be done." Such was the language of the two Bishops who represented the see of Rome in the largest Council which has ever been held, wherein, however, among 520 Bishops, but two Western were present besides themselves. *And Dioscorus, though possessing the third Patriarchal See, was obliged to submit without opposition, and to abandon his place among the Bishops.*—P. 188.

We must ask our readers to look back again to the passage which we have quoted. They will see there a fact stated, and a lesson drawn from it. The fact is the immediate dismissal of Dioscorus, the lesson the overpowering influence of Rome. Now we will place before them the very words to which Mr. Wilberforce refers for his fact and lesson. The first sentence is correct; we will not therefore repeat it, but merely observe that the 'we' who are 'ordered' means the Legates, not the Council.

"This order we must keep; if therefore it seems good to your magnificence" (the magistrates) "let him go out or we will go out." The glorious magistrates and most illustrious senators said—"Why, what special charge is brought against the most pious Bishop Dioscorus?" The most pious Bishop Paschasinus, the legate of the Apostolic Throne, said—"It was necessary that he should be objected to on his entrance." The most noble magistrates and most illustrious senators said,—*"As we have already said, a special crime of which he is guilty must be exhibited."* The pious Bishop Lucentius, who held the place of the Apostolic Chair, said, "Let him give account of the judgment which he passed himself, for he grasped the character of judge when he had not obtained it, and he dared to hold a synod without the authority of the Apostolic Throne, which never has occurred, nor ought to occur." The most pious Bishop Paschasinus, legate of the Apostolic Throne, said, "We (the legates) cannot go against the commands of the most blessed and Apostolic Bishop, who rules the Apostolic Throne, nor against the ecclesiastical canons and the traditions of the Fathers." The most glorious magistrates and most illustrious senators said—"It is fitting that you exhibit what special crime he has been guilty of." The most pious Bishop Lucentius, legate of the Apostolic Throne, said, "It is not endurable that such an insult should be offered to us and to you, as that he should sit here when he is brought forward to be judged." The most noble magistrates and most illustrious senators said—"If you hold the character of a judge, you ought not to plead like an accuser." *And Dioscorus, the most pious Bishop of Alexandria, by the command of the most glorious magistrates and of the sacred senate, remained sitting amongst the others; and the most pious Roman Bishops sat down in their places and kept quiet; and Eusebius, the most pious Bishop of Dorylæum, came forward and said, "Command my petition to be read, as has seemed good to the most pious Emperor. I am wronged by Dioscorus; the faith is wronged. Bishop Flavian has been murdered. He and I were unjustly condemned by him. Command my petition to be read." The most glorious magistrates and the magnificent senate said, "Let his petition be read." And Eusebius, by the desire of every one, sat down, and Veronician, the sacred secretary of the divine Consistory, took his petition and read it.*—*Harduin*, ii. 67.

Thus, the statement that 'Dioscorus was obliged to submit without opposition, and to abandon his place among the Bishops,' is wholly untrue; and instead of any deference being paid to the Archbishop of Rome, his demand is coolly and contemptuously put aside, and his representatives have to sit down and hold their tongues, after they had threatened to leave the Council if their request was not complied with. The same contemptuous disregard is shown impartially towards the Roman legates when they demand the dismissal of Dioscorus, and towards the Egyptian Bishops when they demand the dismissal of Theodoret. In both cases the magistrates overrule the objectors' petition. So far from true is it, that Dioscorus had 'to submit without opposition, and abandon his place,' that he sat throughout the whole of the Action, the account of which occupies from p. 67 to p. 274 in Harduin's closely-printed folio edition of the Councils: he took an active part in the debates: the acts of the Latrocinium and Flavian's Constantinopolitan Council were read: he was accused, and he defended himself. And at length the magistrates passed sentence on him thus:

"Since it has been shown, by our inquiry into what was done and determined, and by the confession of the leaders of the late Synod (the Latrocinium), who acknowledge themselves to have been in error, and to have deprived those who all the time were orthodox, that Flavian of pious memory, and the most pious Bishop Eusebius, have been unjustly deposed, it seems to us, according to God's good pleasure, that it is just (if so it seem well to our most divine and pious Lord) that Dioscorus, the most religious Bishop of Alexandria, Juvenal, &c., who held authority, and were leaders in that Synod, should fall under the same punishment that they then inflicted, and should be deprived of their Episcopal dignity, by the sacred Synod, according to the canons, care being taken that everything which occurs is made known to our divine head (the Emperor)." The Easterns and the most pious Bishops with them said, "That is a just judgment!" The Illyrians and the most pious Bishops with them said, "We have all made a mistake! Let us all obtain pardon!" The Easterns and the most pious Bishops with them said, "Long life to the senate! God holy, holy and strong, holy and immortal, have mercy upon us! Long life to the Emperor! The impious man is ever put to flight! Christ has put down Dioscorus! God has put down the murderer! This is a just sentence! this is a just Synod! the senate is just! God hath avenged his martyrs!"—*Harduin*, ii. 271

It was after *this* sentence, and not till after this sentence, that Dioscorus 'abandoned his place among the Bishops.'

The second Action was occupied with the discussion of the Faith. At the third the magistrates were not present, and the attention of the Council was again called to Dioscorus. Other enormities were charged against him. He was thrice summoned, and refused to appear; and then, one after the other, the Bishops declared their sentence against him. The Pope's legates of course spoke, or 'pronounced sentence' (p. 129), first, because they were presiding; then all the other Bishops; and afterwards



they severally subscribed. Mr. Wilberforce quotes the latter part of the legates' sentence, but he omits the concluding words. They are as follows:—'Therefore this most holy and great Synod will pronounce sentence upon the afore-mentioned Dioscorus, in accordance with the canons.' And immediately Anatolius rises and says, 'I am in all things of the same mind with the Apostolic Throne, and I give my vote too for the deposition of Dioscorus, who has shown himself incapable of all priestly ministry, *because he has disobeyed the canons of the holy Fathers in everything, and has refused to obey when thrice canonically summoned.*' Each of the other Bishops gives his reasons for his vote; and it is remarkable, that *not one* of these expresses any deference towards Pope Leo of Rome, without in the same breath expressing *the same* deference to Pope Anatolius of Constantinople. That the sentence was 'founded' in any special manner 'on the celebrated letter which Leo had addressed to Flavianus' (p. 189), is again wholly untrue. That letter has not in it, and *could not* have in it, a single word directly referring to Dioscorus, or the causes of his deposition. It was written before the Latrocinium was held, and was to have been read at the Latrocinium; and it contained an exposition of the Faith against Eutychianism, which was not laid to the charge of Dioscorus at Chalcedon. We believe that every sentence in this and the following pages of Mr. Wilberforce's book contains a misstatement. We have not space to point them all out. For ample and incontrovertible proof that this celebrated letter was submitted to the judgment of the Council, as superior in authority to the writer, and that it was approved only because it was found on examination to be in accordance with the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus, we must refer our readers to the above-named works of Bossuet and Mr. Allies, and to 'Papal Supremacy,' &c. p. 21, or better still, to Harduin, ii. 386.

Again, that 'Dioscorus was sentenced on the very ground 'that, with the aid of the Council over which he presided, he 'had ventured to pass judgment on the Pope' (p. 189), is in several ways incorrect. It was not Leo, but Flavian of Constantinople, and Eusebius of Dorylæum, on whom Dioscorus passed judgment at the Latrocinium. And this, as we have seen, was the reason which the magistrates gave for his own deposition. Other aggravating causes are added afterwards by the Roman legates and by the Synod, in a letter to the Emperors and to Leo, and amongst them, and placed upon the same level with his disobedience to the summons of the Council, is an attempt at excommunicating Leo; but this cannot be what Mr. Wilberforce refers to, as he did not do this 'by aid of the

Council over which he presided' at Ephesus, which is clearly the Council referred to, nor by the aid of any Council at all. Baronius, it is true, says that he excommunicated Leo in Alexandria, at a Council of ten Bishops, (a magnificent body 'to preside over,') in the year 449; but Pagi has shown this to be a mistake. It was in the year 451 that he issued the excommunication, holding no Council about it at all, but getting ten Bishops, friendly to himself, to sign the sentence; and the place at which he issued it was Nicæa, where the General Council was originally gathered, before it was transferred to Chalcedon.<sup>1</sup>

The case of Theodoret again teaches the very contrary lesson to that for which it is advanced. Although received to communion by Leo, he was brought forward in the Council, and required to anathematize Nestorius. On his hesitating to do so, he was denounced as a heretic: on his doing it, and not till then, he was restored to his Church by the decree of the Council.<sup>2</sup> 'So, then,' says Bossuet, 'the judgment put forth 'by Leo concerning his restoration to his see, would have profited Theodoret nothing, unless after the matter had been 'brought before the Council, he had both approved his faith 'to the Council, and the judgment of Leo had been confirmed 'by the same Council.' If 'the power of acting in the interim, 'on which the ordinary government of the Church depends, is 'shown to be left to the Bishop of Rome' (p. 189), by his having been the first to acknowledge the orthodoxy of Theodoret, how much greater power is shown to be vested in the Bishop of Alexandria, by the measures by which S. Athanasius restored peace to Christendom after the Arian troubles?

The statement, then, that the Council of Chalcedon yields submission to the Pope, in regard to orders which he had previously given to his legates, in the case of Dioscorus, in respect to Leo's letter, or in the case of Theodoret, is not true.

'2dly. The Council applies to the Pope to confirm its decision, and *that which is not confirmed by him falls to the ground.*' Not only is this not founded in fact, but it is contrary to fact. The famous 28th Canon, granting to Constantinople coequal and coordinate rights and dignities with Rome, was passed, and 'failed to obtain Leo's confirmation,' but it did *not* 'fall to the ground.' On the contrary, ever since that time, Constantinople has ranked above Alexandria and Antioch, and next to Rome. The canon was again renewed in the Council in Trullo, as follows:—Canon xxxvi. 'Renewing the decrees of the hundred 'and fifty holy Fathers assembled in this heaven-protected royal

<sup>1</sup> Baronius ad an. 449, vol. viii. p. 47. Pagi ad an. 449, No. 23. Mansi, p. 510.

<sup>2</sup> Hard. ii. p. 499.

<sup>3</sup> Boss. Def. Cler. Gall. vii. 13.

'city, and those of the six hundred and thirty Fathers assembled at Chalcedon, we decree that the See of Constantinople shall enjoy equal prerogatives with the See of Elder Rome, and be magnified, as that is, in ecclesiastical matters, being second after it; next to which, let the See of the great city of Alexandria rank, then that of Antioch, and then that of Jerusalem.' Mr. Allies' comment on this canon is noticeable. He says:—

'Here the famous 28th canon of Chalcedon is referred to as part of the decrees of that Council. By which, as well as by the whole of the intervening history, we may see the utter untruthfulness of the assertion, that it was given up through the opposition of S. Leo. And of course the utter incompatibility of this canon with the present Papal Idea is plain at once. It sets clearly before the eyes the enormous and world-wide difference between Primacy and Supremacy. It comes to us on the sanction of two Œcumenical Councils, and a third intended to be so, and which, though not so, has remained the living rule of one half of the Church for 1150 years. But further, we have S. Leo's own authority for saying, that the Roman Church in his day knew nothing of the canons of the second Œcumenical Council; so that from 381 to 451, the whole East was governed by canons never even carried to the Pope; and though S. Leo absolutely refused to receive, and did all he could to annul the 28th canon of Chalcedon, yet his legates at that very Council found Anatolius in full possession of the second place among the Patriarchs, did not attempt to disturb him in it, nay, made it a charge against Dioscorus, that he had pushed Flavian of Constantinople down to the fifth place. In fact, from the Council of 381, the Patriarch of Constantinople is found acting as second Bishop of the Church; he was so at Chalcedon in 451, he was so at Constantinople in 553, and again in 681, and he was so *in spite* of all the Pope could do against him.'—P. 391.

'Leo withheld his approval on the one hand, and on the other the canon prevailed throughout the East; and the See of Constantinople has ever since been accepted there as the first See of the East.'—*Papal Supremacy*, &c. p. 25.

'3dly. It rests the deference paid to the Pope on his claim to represent S. Peter.'

To prove the contrary of this statement, we have but to quote a part of this same 28th canon. 'The Fathers have, as was just and natural (*εἰκότως*), given its privileges to the throne of Elder Rome, because'—the Pope represents S. Peter? No! but because, 'that is the imperial city, and moved by the same purpose the 150 religious Bishops gave equal prerogatives to the most holy throne of New Rome, rightly judging that the city which is honoured with the Emperor and the Senate ought to enjoy equal prerogatives with the Elder royal Rome, and to be magnified in ecclesiastical matters as she is, being second after her.' That by these prerogatives are not meant the real prerogatives of Rome, but only 'the accidents of dignity' attached to them' (p. 191), is one of those 'clever but wholly arbitrary distinctions' which rest upon no foundation whatever, but which Bossuët terms 'inventions.'

'4thly. It attributes to the Pope a peculiar personal dignity, so

‘that those who assault him are supposed in an especial manner ‘to assault the Church.’ ‘When summing up the crimes of Dioscorus it is his attack upon the Bishop of Rome, *as being fatal to the order and oneness of the Church, which forms the climax of their charge.* And that not only in their letter to ‘Leo himself, but also to the Emperors’ (p. 192). The crimes of Dioscorus, which led to his deposition, are given (1) by the magistrates, (2) by the legates, (3) by Anatolius of Constantinople, (4) by the rest of the Bishops, (5) in the letter addressed to Dioscorus by the Synod, (6) in the letter addressed to the Alexandrian clergy, (7) in the letter addressed to the Emperors, (8) in the letter addressed to Leo. (1) The magistrates give only one reason; they say that it is because he deposed Flavian of Constantinople, and Eusebius of Dorylæum in the Latrocinium (Hard. ii. 271). (2) The legates give as the reasons, (a) that he had acted contrary to the canons and ecclesiastical discipline; (β) that he had re-admitted Eutyches to communion; (γ) that he had not allowed Leo’s letter to be read at the Latrocinium. ‘But he has ‘overshot his former wickedness by fresh crimes;’ viz. (δ) ‘he ‘has dared to dictate an excommunication against Leo the ‘Archbishop of great Rome; (ε) many charges of iniquity have ‘been brought before the holy Synod against him; (ζ) thrice ‘summoned he has disobeyed; (η) he has received to communion men lawfully and synodically deposed’ (Hard. ii. 345). (3) Anatolius gives as the reasons, (a) that he had been disobedient to the canons of the Fathers; (β) that he had disobeyed the threefold summons (Hard. ii. 345). Elsewhere he gives the reasons as, (a) the excommunication of Leo; (β) the disobedience to the summons (Hard. ii. 450). (4) The causes commonly given by the Bishops are, (a) that he has broken the canons, (β) that he has disobeyed the Council’s summons; if they say anything about his conduct to Leo, they place his conduct to Anatolius on the same footing. Thus Patricius of Tyana finds him guilty of ‘despising both the divine canons, ‘and also the most holy Fathers and Archbishops, Leo of Old ‘Rome, and Anatolius of New Rome, and all the holy and ‘Œcumenical Council’ (Hard. ii. 350). (5) The letter to Dioscorus himself gives as the reasons, (a) ‘because thou hast ‘despised the divine canons, and (β) hast been disobedient to ‘this holy and Œcumenical Council, in that, in addition to ‘your other crimes, in which thou hast been found out, thou ‘hast been thrice summoned by this holy and great Council according to the divine canons, to answer to the charges laid ‘against thee, and hast not come’ (Hard. ii. 378). (6) The letter to the Alexandrian clergy gives the same two reasons.

(7) The letter to the Emperors gives as the reasons, (a) that he had refused to allow Leo's letter to be read at the Latrocinium, (β) that he had readmitted Eutyches and others. 'And perhaps he might have obtained forgiveness for such and so great crimes, if he would have asked for medicine from the Œcumenical Council by worthy repentance; but since over and above his other wickednesses (γ) he has barked against the Apostolical See itself, and has endeavoured to issue letters of excommunication against the most holy and blessed Pope Leo, he has arrogantly persisted in his former iniquities; and (ε) being insolent towards this holy Œcumenical and great Council, he has in utter contempt refused to answer to the different accusations against him; and though three times summoned according to the divine canons, has not deigned to appear.' (8) The letter to Leo himself gives as the reasons, (a) that he had deposed Flavian and Eusebius; (β) that he had readmitted Eutyches; 'and falling like a wild beast upon the Vine, he has torn up the best plant that he found there, and brought in that which had been thrown out as fruitless . . . and in addition to all this, (γ) he extended his madness against even the person who had been entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the Vine—we mean your Holiness,—and he practised excommunication against the man who had exerted himself to unite the body of the Church; and when he ought to repent of these things, and to ask with tears for mercy, he has rejoiced in them as excellent deeds, (δ) rejecting your Holiness's letter and setting himself against all the doctrines of the truth;' (ε) 'and he refused to obey three summonses addressed to him.'

Thus the causes of Dioscorus' deposition are various, and his excommunication of Leo is never spoken of alone, as 'forming a climax,' but always together with his refusal to obey the summons of the Council, which Mr. Wilberforce does not mention at all; and when these two last are put together as specially aggravating his guilt, we are also told how they did so; viz., by showing that he was still obstinate, and refused to recant his errors. As to the magnificent titles with which Leo is addressed by the Council, we must recollect that this was an age of magnificent titles; that the Emperor is frequently called, *Θεία κορυφή*, Divine Head, by the presiding magistrates in the course of the Council; and that in this letter the Constantinopolitans were but making up with Eastern wordiness for the bitter potion of the 9th and 28th canons, which they forced against his will upon the Western Patriarch. They could spare a few compliments when they had enacted by canon the equality of the Pope of Constantinople with the Pope

of Rome in ecclesiastical honour and privileges, and the superiority of the former to the latter in the substantial right of receiving appeals. But that they considered the Roman Bishop as the guardian of the Vine in any other sense but that in which they held themselves to be the same, is opposed to their every word and every act. To quote one out of innumerable passages, the Eastern prelates in the Fifth General Council when consciously regarding themselves as distinct from, and opposed to, the Roman prelate, express themselves as follows:—‘We, therefore, to whom is committed the charge of ruling the Church of the Lord, fearing the malediction which hangs over those who do the work of the Lord negligently, hasten to preserve the good seed of faith pure from the tares of impiety.’ And individuals are spoken of in just the same manner. For example, S. Basil speaks of S. Athanasius as *κορυφή τῶν ὅλων*, ‘the head of the whole;’ and says, in writing to the same Father, ‘There lies upon you as great a care and solicitude for all the Churches as for that which was peculiarly committed to your charge by our common Lord.’ And again, ‘Our Lord has constituted thee the physician of the infirmities of the Churches,’ and S. Gregory Nazianzen says likewise of S. Athanasius, ‘that he was entrusted with the mastership (*ἐπιστοσίαν*) of the whole world.’ In like manner, Lupus, *Bishop of Troyes*, is thus addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris:—‘Thou, a father of fathers, and Bishop of Bishops, and another S. James of thy age, dost, as from a certain watch-tower of charity, and not from the lower Jerusalem, oversee all the members of the Church of our God; worthy to comfort all the infirm, and to be deservedly consulti of all.’<sup>1</sup>

However, it is true that the Bishop of Rome presided at Chalcedon, and so Mr. Wilberforce says, ‘It seems needless to go further in Church history in proof that the Bishop of Rome was supposed to possess the power of presiding in Councils; for what can be more conclusive than that which has been adduced from the Council of Chalcedon?’ (p. 193). Most true, that it is shown that the Bishop of Rome ‘possessed the right of presiding in Councils,’ *equally with the other great Bishops of the Church*; most false, that it is shown that he possessed any *exclusive* right, or any right as *Primate* in the sense in which Mr. Wilberforce requires us to understand Primate. The Council of Jerusalem equally proves that the Bishop of Jerusalem ‘was supposed to possess the power of presiding in Councils;’ the

<sup>1</sup> S. Basil, Ep. 69, ad Athan. Op. tom. iii. p. 161, 162. Ep. 82, p. 175. S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 21, § 7. Op. tom. i. p. 389. Sid. Ap. lib. vi. Ep. 1. ad Lup. Bib. Patr. Galland, tom. x. p. 513. See Casaubon’s Treatise; Hickes, vol. iii. p. 100.



Council of Nicæa, that the Bishop of Cordova was supposed to possess the same power; the Council of Constantinople, that the Bishops of Antioch and Constantinople were supposed to possess the same power; and the two Councils of Ephesus, that the Bishop of Alexandria was supposed to possess the same power. 'What can be more conclusive'?

But though it is thus 'needless to go further in Church history,' yet one more Council shall be cited, as having been a sort of sequel and appendage to the Council of Chalcedon, viz. the 'Sixth General Council, which met to complete the work of its precursor by censuring the heresy of the Monothelites, which had grown out of that of Eutyches. It was held at Constantinople, A.D. 680' (p. 193). The Council of Chalcedon was, as every one knows, the *fourth* Œcumenical Council. Then why does Mr. Wilberforce leave out the *fifth*, and go on to the *sixth*? The reason is very simple. It is that *at the fifth, the Pope of Rome did not preside. He was present neither in person, (although he was in the very city where it was being held,) nor by his legates, and he was by implication, but designedly, anathematized by the Council as a supporter of heresy.* Now, what kind of dealing with an historical question is this? Mr. Wilberforce has a theory about Councils. To bend the facts connected with the earliest Councils is a sufficiently hard work, but he does at least attempt it. Presently he reaches the fifth General Council. This lies right athwart the very course of his argument, and no ingenuity can make it fit with his hypothesis. How does he proceed? Does he deny the facts? No! that is impossible. Does he, then, give up his theory? No! Does he even acknowledge the difficulty? No! What else remains? A very simple expedient — he omits all notice of the fifth Council, and *skips* from the fourth to the sixth. This may be ingenious, but it is not, after all, so convincing as straightforwardness, and it is unworthy of one who professes to be examining and inquiring before the solemn tribunal of God, and in the sincerity of his own soul.

And when Mr. Wilberforce has thus reached the sixth Council, how does he deal with it? He professes to exhibit from it 'the relation of the ancient Universal Councils to the successor of S. Peter' (p. 194). With such a profession as this in his mouth, is it fair, is it right, is it conceivable, that he should have concealed the fact that Pope Honorius was anathematized by name in this Council; and that the Council itself was not presided over by Pope Agatho's legates, who were present, but by the Emperor Constantine; and that he should have quoted as the genuine exponent of the mind of the Council a corrupted passage which does not appear in the Greek text,

which was alone read to the Council? The lesson that Bossuet learns is something very different. He writes—

‘As the third, fourth, and fifth Councils passed judgment on the decisions of Roman Pontiffs, and only approved of them after inquiry, so the sixth Council is known to have done; and that course is common to all Councils. . . . They inquire into the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, and after inquiry made, approve Agatho’s decrees, condemn those of Honorius. . . . This we find to be certain. Honorius duly questioned by three patriarchs *de fide*, gave the worst answer possible; was condemned with anathema by the sixth Council; was excused by Roman Pontiffs before the supreme sentence of the Council, and after that sentence was condemned with the same anathema.’<sup>1</sup>—*Def. Cler. Gall.* vii. 21, 26.

Certainly if Mr. Wilberforce has represented history fairly, Bossuet has disgracefully misstated it. For example, Mr. Wilberforce’s last remarks on the subject of Councils is as follows, and it is put forth as though no one had ever denied or doubted it:—‘The Council of Chalcedon rests its deference to Leo on the same grounds which were stated by S. Peter Chrysologus, just before it assembled, “Blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his own see, supplies truth of faith to those who seek it”’ (p. 195). Bossuet has written many pages demonstrating the contrary of this assertion, and there are few statements which admit of so ample and satisfactory a refutation, for all the Bishops, one after the other, give their reasons for accepting Leo’s letter. Not one rests it upon the simple authority of the see of Rome. Almost every one says that he accepts it because it agrees with other received documents and professions of faith. Indeed, Leo’s orthodoxy is tested by his agreement with Cyril: Alexandria is made the standard by which to try Rome.

All, then, that Mr. Wilberforce has proved about the Councils is this, that the Bishop of Rome presided at one, and only one, out of the six first General Councils, viz. at the Council of Chalcedon. If, then, ‘the right of presiding at Councils inheres in the Primacy,’ it is clear that the Bishop of Rome could not have held the Primacy, and that there could have been no such Primacy in the Church.

The third test by which the Supremacy is to be identified with the Primacy is, ‘the right of interference in all ecclesias-

<sup>1</sup> The sentence on Honorius is as follows:—‘Besides this, we order that Honorius, who was Pope of ancient Rome, be cast out of the holy Church of God and anathematized, because we find, by his writings to Sergius, that he has in all things followed his mind, and confirmed his impious dogmas.’—Hard. iii. 1599. Pope Leo II. writes—‘We anathematize also Honorius, who did not illumine this apostolical Church with the doctrine of apostolical tradition, but by a foul betrayal attempted to subvert its spotless faith.’—Hard. iii. 1475. The seventh Council also refers to the excommunication, and Honorius’ name is found among the anathematized in the *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*.—Routh’s *Opusc.* ii. 153.

'tical appointments.' 'This was, no doubt, the last of the three 'to receive legal form and expression' (p. 195). 'But it was 'not till long afterwards that the system of referring to the see 'of S. Peter received that settled form which gave stability to 'the mediæval Church: and the great agent through which 'this work was effected was not a Roman Bishop, but our 'countryman, S. Boniface the Apostle of Germany' (p. 199). 'It 'was through the example and influence of this first of English 'missionaries, and through the glory of his martyrdom, that 'the system prevailed for which he offered up his life' (201). So the two offices of the Primacy and of the Supremacy are to be identified by their both exercising a function, which function was confessedly not exercised till the eight century after Christ. This seems to us childish. Meantime, Mr. Wilberforce has not given us one of the innumerable testimonies of Councils Œcumenical and Provincial, of Bishops, of Doctors, of Martyrs, and of Fathers, that interference in one branch, or 'Diocese,' of the Church by any one Bishop not belonging to that 'Diocese,' was forbidden throughout the early ages by the whole authority of the Church Catholic, unless such interferences took place simply ἀγαπητικῶς, and then it belonged to all Bishops, one as much as another. If we were to quote all the passages on this subject in the writings of the Doctors of the Church, we should fill an octavo volume: simply to transcribe the canons of the Councils which were passed for the purpose of maintaining the independence of the Churches of the several 'Dioceses,' would fill many pages. We must refer our readers to the Council of Nicæa, canons v. vi.; to the Council of Constantinople, canons ii. iii. vi.; to the Council of Ephesus, canons i. viii.; to the Council of Chalcedon, canons ix. xvii. xxviii. xxx. Almost all of these canons are given in the Greek, Latin, and English, in 'Papal Supremacy,' &c., p. 69. We have here only room for part of the eighth Ephesine canon:—

'This same rule shall be kept also in the other "Dioceses" and the provinces throughout the world, that no one of the religious Bishops shall lay his hand upon another province which has not been under his, that is, his predecessor's control, originally and from the beginning; and if he has laid his hand upon it and forcibly reduced it under himself, he is to restore it; that the canons of the fathers be not transgressed, and the pride of worldly power be secretly introduced under the cover of the priestly function, and by little and little, without marking the steps by which it is lost, we be deprived of the liberty which our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has given us by His own blood.'—P. 73.

We must add part of the second Constantinopolitan canon:—

'Bishops who are outside a "Diocese," are not to invade the Churches which are across the borders, nor to bring confusion into the Churches; but according to the canons, the Bishop of Alexandria must have the sole ad-

ministration of the affairs of Egypt, and the Bishops of the East must administer the East only (the privileges which are assigned to the Church of Antioch by the canons made at Nicœa being preserved), and the Bishop of the Asian Diocese must administer the affairs of the Asian only, and those of the Pontic Diocese, the affairs of the Pontic only, and those of Thrace. the affairs of Thrace only. Moreover, Bishops are not without invitation to go beyond the bounds of their Diocese for the purpose of ordaining, or any other ecclesiastical function.'—P. 12.

If once the force of these two canons is appreciated, we may see in them, as in a mirror, the whole constitution of the Church at the time of the Council of Constantinople. We must again remind our readers that in reading of a 'Diocese,' they must put out of their thoughts what is now called by that name but was then denominated a Parish, and they must recollect that something is meant very little, if at all different, from a National Church. That which was presided over by a Bishop was called *παροικία*, or Parish; that which was presided over by a Metropolitan was called an *ἐπαρχία*, or Province, and consisted of many *παροικίαι*; that which was presided over by a Patriarch, Exarch, or Primate (according as he had one or other of these three names) was called a Diocese. Now, this word Diocese is not originally an ecclesiastical term: it is the name of a civil division of the Empire, constituted by several provinces, and ruled by a præfect. There was then established in each of these Dioceses a Church containing a hierarchy, in which we may mark three steps,—the lowest, the Bishops, whose jurisdiction was confined to their *παροικίαι*; the next, the Metropolitans (two, three, or more in number, according as the Diocese was larger or smaller), each of whom had jurisdiction over a province; and, lastly, a Primate, who had jurisdiction over the whole Church of the Diocese. There is nothing more clearly brought out by the ancient canons than that each of these Churches was a distinct and independent whole in itself, bound, it is true, to the other sister Churches by the tie of love and the bond of the Holy Spirit uniting them all to their one Head and to one another, but absolutely free from all authoritative control exercised by any Bishops whatever without the limits of that Church or Diocese. At the time of the second Council the world was divided into thirteen such Dioceses; five of them are referred to in the above-quoted canons,—viz. Egypt, the East (*i.e.* the parts about Antioch), Asia, Pontus, Thrace. The eight others are—Italy, Macedonia, Dacia, Illyria, Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain. As then there were thirteen Dioceses, the theory of the Church was, that there should be thirteen Diocesan Churches; and this theory was carried out, except so far as it was prevented from taking effect by the inhabitants of some of these Dioceses not having been Christianized. It is of these Dioceses that the canon

speaks—'Bishops who are outside a *Diocese* must not invade the Churches which are across the borders, nor bring confusion into the Churches.'

So far the constitution of the Church is clear enough. It consisted theoretically of thirteen independent, federal, Diocesan Churches. But now there came in two cross principles; the first was, that the Primate of that Diocesan Church which contained the greatest cities should borrow dignity from the greatness of those cities; the second, that respect should be paid to those Churches which were founded by the Apostles. In accordance with the second of these principles, we have seen that Tertullian declares that those Churches ought to be held in special regard which were founded by S. Paul and S. Peter, and thus an undefined reverence gathered around the names of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, which caused certain prerogatives of honour to be attached to the holders of those sees, above the other Primates. This principle, however, had not nearly so much weight and influence as the other that has been mentioned. We have seen that the Councils of Constantinople, Chalcedon, and Constantinople II. give as the reason of the prerogatives assigned to Rome and Constantinople the presence of the imperial power in those cities. And even had they not so expressly declared it, we might have gathered that it must have been so, for otherwise the apostolic sees of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria would never have allowed the unapostolic see of Constantinople to be preferred before themselves without making complaint; and indeed, on any other principle than this, the order of the Diocesan Churches would have been, Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Alexandria, rather than Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and on the Roman hypothesis of S. Peter's authority, still less could Alexandria have been placed before Antioch, had it not been that the Bishops ranked according to the greatness of their cities.

By virtue, then, of the first of these cross principles, the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were endued with a dignity which other Primates had not; by virtue of the second, the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople were raised above their brother Primates; so much so, that at the Council of Chalcedon a certain authority was given to the Patriarch of Constantinople over three Diocesan Churches, and appeals were allowed to him as much as to the appellant's own Patriarch from all parts of the Church. These were two points in which encroachments were made on the ancient constitution of the Church in favour of Constantinople; but yet it was done legitimately at an Ecumenical Council, and was of course capable of revision at any time. Rome never had any such

power, except by assumption and usurpation; all that she could and did appeal to was the Provincial Council of Sardica, (the canons of which Pope after Pope attempted to pass off as those of Nicæa,) and the decrees of the Western Emperors which backed her power. But still the Patriarch of Rome was Primate of a Diocese, Bishop of the imperial city, and possessor of an Apostolical see. There was no other Bishop who could claim all three of these advantages. For Constantinople was not founded by an Apostle, and Alexandria and Antioch were not imperial cities. Rome, therefore, was likely to push her power beyond its bounds, and it would seem that it was often with special regard to her that the Church passed its emphatic laws, forbidding the Bishop of one Diocese to interfere with the Bishops of another Diocese. In later times she did so 'interfere in ecclesiastical appointments,' though these laws remain to this day unrepealed, though she was never exempted from them as the see of Constantinople may seem partially to have been at Chalcedon; and the means by which she gained her right of interference in the West—for she never had it in the East—were mainly the false Decretals of Isidore, and the Decretum of Gratian founded upon them.

Were we drawing a picture of the ancient constitution of the Church, it would be necessary to dwell further on the different names of Patriarch, Exarch, and Primate, and on those Churches which had the privilege of *αὐτοκεφαλία*, i. e., which were governed by Metropolitans alone, and had no Primate; but we have said enough to show how entirely contrary to the spirit of the early Church it was, that the Patriarch of Rome should 'interfere in the ecclesiastical appointments' of any other Diocese except his own, and how entirely contrary to fact it is that he did so.

We conclude, then, that whereas Mr. Wilberforce has arbitrarily fixed a threefold test, in itself insufficient, whereby to identify the Supremacy with the Primacy, the test breaks down in all its three branches; that he has not shown, nor can it be shown, that the right of finally deciding ecclesiastical causes was in the early Church vested in the Bishop of Rome any more than in the other great Bishops of Christendom; that he has not shown, nor can it be shown, that the right of presiding at Councils was vested in the Bishop of Rome any more than in the other great Bishops of Christendom; that he has not shown, nor can it be shown, that the right of interfering in all ecclesiastical appointments was vested in the Bishop of Rome any more than in the other great Bishops of Christendom.

If the case were one which required still further confirmation—if appeal to authority were still needed—such authority might



easily be obtained. It is but within a few months that death has taken away from us the wisdom and learning of one who has so long held the position of the Patriarch of ecclesiastical learning in our elder University. The venerable head of the President of Magdalen College, white with the snows of near a hundred years, has been bowed to the grave which has so long spared him to us. For more than eighty years he lived amidst the Fathers of the Church. Chrysostom, Augustine, Basil, Ambrose, were to him as familiar friends, and their writings and maxims as household words. He has left to us his matured judgment on the question of the power of the Roman see in the primitive Church:

'Assuredly,' he writes, 'it is a thing contrary to the decision both of the Eastern and Western Churches in the first ages, that any power over the faith of the other Churches, or immunity from error, should be acknowledged in the Roman Church as granted by God to it. Whatever the rights and privileges of the first see now are, or ever have been, the Eastern Church at least declared that they rested on no other foundation except ancient custom and synodical constitution; nay, the whole world in the Nicene Council ascribes its rights to that see and to the other greater Churches on no other ground except as having arisen from ancient custom. And however much honour the Bishops of the City of Rome have gained to themselves from the greatness of the Apostles Peter and Paul, the founders of the Roman Church, yet it was "because that was the imperial city," as the General Council of Chalcedon has declared, "that the Fathers, as was right and natural, gave them their prerogatives." . . . The appeals to the Roman Bishop, which the Sardinian Council allowed through partiality to him, and in honour to S. Peter (to the effect that some causes, although previously judged, might be reconsidered in the same province in which they arose, provided that the pontiff so ordered), were far from being sanctioned by the Universal Church. This is clearly proved by the sixth canon of the second General Council, and the ninth canon of the Council of Chalcedon. Nay, we know from a letter of the Roman pontiff, Nicolas I., to Photius, that the Council of Sardica itself was not acknowledged by the Greeks in the ninth century. I say nothing of the false Decretals in which these appeals appear, for they are now known by all to be forged commodities, and to have been foisted in a little before the time of Photius.'—*Scrip. Eccl. Opusc., Præf.* p. vi.

This famous forgery of the Decretal Letters, which had such an enormous influence on the Church, and deceived it for 700 years, Mr. Wilberforce dismisses in half a page, as having been rather detrimental than otherwise to the Papal power. That, on the contrary, this forgery is the main foundation of the Supremacy—the bridge by which the Roman prelates passed from being first Bishops *in* the Church, to being (in the West) Supreme Monarchs *over* the Church—is made clear by Fleury, 'Troisième et Quatrième Discours,' De Marca, 'De Concordiâ,' vii. 20; Van Espen, iii. 478; 'Papal Supremacy,' &c., p. 52. 'That which the East and we have rejected,' says Mr. Allies, 'is not the Pope's Primacy, as it was understood and practised in

'the time of the seven Ecumenical Councils, but the universal Bishopric, of which Nicholas I. laid the foundations, Gregory VII. reared the structure, and Innocent III. completed the building... Nicholas I. and the succeeding pontiffs made use of the False Decretals to build up their spiritual monarchy, and the new principles contained in them became the basis of Gratian's Decretum, and consequently of the Church's discipline in the West' (Pref. p. xiv.).

IV. We have lastly to show, that Mr. Wilberforce has not proved that in the sixteenth century the English Church rejected the divinely constituted head and centre of Christendom, and assumed the King or Queen of England as the head and centre of unity, but that this statement is a false statement.

There is something so extremely preposterous in this proposition, so entirely opposed to what we all know, feel, and understand, that we have scarcely patience to adduce grave arguments against it. There is, however, no appearance of anything but seriousness in Mr. Wilberforce's method of dealing with the subject, and we will, therefore, meet him in the same spirit.

Mr. Wilberforce's theory is stated as follows:—

'The purpose which the Crown's Supremacy was intended to effect, was exactly that which our Lord's promise to S. Peter was designed to secure. The operation of that promise, as we have seen, was to form the college of Apostles into a single body, and then to enable them to act together in the maintenance of truth. This is the precise object assigned to it by the early Fathers; and this is just that which Henry VIII. proposed to imitate by his Supremacy. Its purpose was to unite the clergy of the English Empire into a single "*body spiritual*." Thus was there a new principle of combination in place of that provided by our Lord.'—P. 232.

'It was the Royal Supremacy by which the English Bishops were first moulded into a body, and thereby were supposed to gain power to decide questions of doctrine.'—P. 233.

'That which qualified it for such functions, was the authority of the Sovereign, which made the Bishops of our two provinces into a body, just as the collective Bishops of Christendom had formerly been combined into the one body of Christ. This was the assertion of the 24th of Henry VIII. 12, and the ground on which the title, Head of the Church, was important. It implied that the Bishops who stood to Henry in the relation of subjects, were combined by that circumstance into a body, or spiritual entity, and had the same power, therefore, to grant mission, or determine doctrine, which had formerly been possessed by the Universal Church.'—P. 228.

'Now is it not clear that the function thus assumed by our Sovereign, is exactly that, which, according to the laws of the ancient Church, belonged to the chief Apostle? Its purpose is to constitute the Bishops into a *whole*, so that they may be able to make final settlement in questions of doctrine.'—P. 237.

'The separation between the Church of England and the rest of Christendom, has been shown to depend upon that spiritual headship which is claimed by our Sovereign, whereby the Bishops of this realm are constituted into a distinct body, and determine all articles of faith, as though they were the whole body of Christ.'—P. 251.

'The new head by whom they were combined into an isolated body.'—P. 253.

'The Royal Supremacy consolidated them into a whole, and thus enabled them to speak with authority.'—P. 275.

'This circumstance (the Sovereign's being Head of the Church), as has been seen, is alleged to give the English clergy that unity which forms them into a whole.'—P. 278.

We believe that there are persons who credit an unfounded assertion when it has been made eight times, simply because it has been made eight times. We, therefore, give Mr. Wilberforce the benefit to be derived from his repeated assertions. We have, however, several remarks to make upon them.

1. We beg our readers to remark how what was, in p. 121, a modest hypothetical resting upon one person's authority: '*If Cyprian has preserved the right interpretation of those events which are recorded in the Gospels, our Lord's reason for giving this especial commission to his chief Apostle, (a thing, by the way, which Cyprian distinctly denies ever was given,) was to secure unity among the rest,*' (a thing, by the way, which Cyprian never says,)—has grown into a categorical, and apparently universal proposition, in p. 232:—'*This is the precise object assigned to it by the early Fathers,*' and has become converted into a law, in p. 237:—'*The function which, according to the laws of the ancient Church, belonged to the chief Apostle.*'

2. We must also ask them to call to mind that this function of S. Peter, which our Sovereigns are represented as having stolen from the Popes, is a fiction, for which, out of all the tomes of antiquity, no support can be found, except such as may be derived from a misinterpreted text of S. Cyprian, which, when rightly interpreted, means just the contrary; and from two passages taken out of the writings of S. Jerome and Optatus, which *do not* really support it, but which is incidentally, and sometimes formally, denied by all the great Doctors of the East, the West, and the South.

3. But with regard to this function of our Sovereigns itself—how and where did Mr. Wilberforce discover it? What facts does the thing rest on? What documents of the Church attest it? Clearly it must be openly professed, if it is the case. For let us think what it is—no less than that our Sovereigns hold towards the Anglican Church the same office which Mr. Wilberforce has been maintaining that S. Peter and his successors held towards the whole Church; *i.e.* that of being the special representative or Vicar of Christ in things spiritual—the centre of unity whereby they are combined into a spiritual whole. Does any one hold such a belief in England, Scotland, America, or the Colonies? We know no such person. Did any one ever hold

it? We never heard of such a person. Has it been put forth in the writings of Anglican Divines? We have never seen it: and yet we have seen many arguments on the subject of the title, 'Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England,' which was adopted by a tyrannical Sovereign many years before the Reformation, borne by his son, and for a time, by his *Roman-Catholic* daughter, and finally repudiated by her and her *Anglo-Catholic* sister. Surely Mr. Wilberforce must have some authority for his statement from the authorized formularies of the Church. Do we then find in the Articles or Canons that the Sovereign is the head and centre of unity which combines the Bishops into a body? Nothing of the kind. All that Mr. Wilberforce appeals to as justifying his assertion, is the 24th Act of Henry VIII. c. 12, which he quotes as follows:—

'They decreed that "this realm of England is an empire, and so hath been accepted in the world," "the body spiritual whereof having power, when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared interpreted, and showed by that part of the said body politic, called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is also at this time, sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain."—P. 223.

Mr. Wilberforce says, 'that the assertion of' this '24th of Henry VIII. c. 12,' is that 'that, which qualified the English Church for such functions (as mission) was the authority of the Sovereign, which made the Bishops of our two provinces into a body, just as the collective Bishops of Christendom had formerly been combined into the one body of Christ.' We have been quite unable to find this in the above extract, or in any part of 24th Henry VIII. c. 12. We have already seen, that there were in the early Church as many 'spiritual bodies' as there were Dioceses, and that the Bishops in their Dioceses were 'reputed for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of numbers, sufficient and meet of themselves, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices as to their rooms spiritual did appertain.' So says, in very similar words, the already-quoted second canon of the second Œcumenical Council, provided always (though the provision is not expressed either in the canon or in the law) that there lay a final appeal, in matters of faith, to a Council of the Universal Church, duly elected and congregated. Now, as the characteristic feature of an empire or kingdom is the power of the Sovereign which extends over it, so the characteristic feature

of a Diocese was the power of the Præfect which extended over it. Would it, then, be just to say, that 'it was the authority of 'the Præfect which qualified the Diocesan Church for its 'functions, and which made the Bishops of the provinces in the 'Diocese into a body,'—'which combined them into a spiritual 'entity,' &c.? If not, neither is it just to say, that it is the authority of the King of England which makes the Bishops of the provinces of the kingdom into a body, combines them into a spiritual entity, &c.

The Act is, like other documents, misquoted. Mr. Wilberforce represents it as though the then Parliament '*decreed*' that 'England is an empire,' and suggests that the purpose of this decree was to draw an analogy between the empire of Rome and the kingdom of England, with a view to ecclesiastical things. Now, that Act of Parliament does not so '*decree*,' and the purpose attributed to its framers in making such a decree is a pure figment resting upon no foundation whatever. The words that Mr. Wilberforce has extracted are not in the Act, but in the preamble to the Act. It begins as follows:—'Whereas by sundry 'old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared 'and expressed *that this realm of England is an empire*, and so 'hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme 'head or king,' &c. The description of the body spiritual, likewise, is not the '*decree*' of the Act, but merely the preamble, creating nothing, and simply repeating an acknowledged fact; a fact recognised by the laws of Edward I., Edward III., Richard II., and Henry IV., against Papal intrusion (laws which are referred to in the same preamble), just as much as by this Act. What is really enacted by the Bill is, 1. That causes about wills, marriages, &c. should be settled within the realm. 2. That appeals to any foreign potentate are forbidden. 3. That appeals should lie from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, from the Bishop to the Archbishop, 'there to be definitively and 'finally ordered, decreed, and adjusted according to justice, without any appellation and provocation to any other person or 'persons, court or courts.' 4. That in cases touching the king appeals might be made—to himself? No. To the *Upper House of Convocation*; and 'whatsoever shall be . . . adjudged by the 'aforesaid prelates, abbots, and priors of the Upper House of the 'said Convocation, as is aforesaid, shall stand and be taken for 'a final decree and sentence . . . and never after to come in question and debate to be examined in any other court or courts.' This is the Act which, according to Mr. Wilberforce, 'asserts' that it is 'the authority of the Sovereign which qualifies the 'Church of England for its functions, and that it is the royal 'authority which combines the Bishops into a body.' And this

Act is the only ground that he has brought forward for his oft-repeated theory.

We presume that any one who was desirous of learning the true position of the English Sovereign towards the Church, would inquire what statements the Church on the one side, and the Crown on the other, have made on the Royal Supremacy. These statements exist, though they are not quoted by Mr. Wilberforce. They are as follows:—

‘We give . . . to our Princes . . . that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scriptures, by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and decrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers.’—*Article 37.*

And Queen Elizabeth’s explanation of her own authority is quite in accordance with the Church’s statement:—

‘Her Majesty neither doth nor will challenge any other authority than that was challenged, and lately used by King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI., which is, *and was of ancient time*, due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power, shall or ought to have any supremacy over them.’—*Wilkins, Concil.* vol. iv. p. 188.

Again, Mr. Wilberforce’s statements with regard to the title, Supreme Head of the Church, are recklessly incorrect. He says:—

‘The title of Supreme Head of the Church of England, still belongs to our Sovereigns by Act of Parliament. It was assigned to them by 25 Henry VIII. 21, s. 2, and by 37 Henry VIII. 17, s. 3, which were revived by the 1st of Elizabeth; and it was again bestowed in 2 and 3 Anne, 11.’—P. 229.

Now the truth is, that it was 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, which assigned the title to our Sovereigns. This was confirmed by 35 Henry VIII. c. 3, and it was declared to be high treason to deny it, by Edward VI. c. 12. All three of these Acts were repealed by 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8; and their repeal was *not reversed but confirmed* by 1 Elizabeth, c. i. 50, that they should ‘stand, remain, and be repealed and void, in such ‘like manner and form as they were before the making of this ‘Act, anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding!’ Those Acts of Henry’s which Mr. Wilberforce quotes, were *not* passed for the purpose of assigning this title to the Sovereign, but the first of them for repressing the pecuniary exactions of Rome, and the second for permitting the marriage of Doctors of Civil Law, and they only incidentally and parenthetically refer to the Supremacy at all. But Mr. Wilberforce says that the title of Supreme Head was again



bestowed on our Sovereigns by 2 and 3 Anne, c. 11. Now who is there who would not suppose from these words, that 2 and 3 Anne, c. 11, was a Bill similar in nature to 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, or 35 Henry VIII. c. 3, enacting that the title, Supreme Head of the Church of England, should belong to the English Sovereigns? This is so far from being the case, that it is the Act which was passed for constituting Queen Anne's Bounty: and there is nothing in it from beginning to end about the title of the Sovereign, except that in the preamble there is the following parenthesis: 'Forasmuch as your Majesty taking into your princely and serious consideration the mean and insufficient maintenance belonging to the clergy in divers parts of this your kingdom, has been most graciously pleased out of your most religious and tender concern for the Church of England, (whereof your Majesty is the only Supreme Head on earth,) and for the poor clergy thereof,' &c. A complimentary expression, contained in a parenthesis of a preamble of a Bill, and addressed to a particular Sovereign, cannot and does not 'bestow' 'the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England' upon 'our Sovereigns,' when that title had been deliberately, and in so many words, rejected by two Acts, which are still the law of the land. There is a very simple test by which we can learn whether or no this title does 'belong to our Sovereigns by Act of Parliament,' or no. In the *Rotuli Parliamenti* the name and titles of the Sovereign are prefixed to the statutes of each year. Is this title found among the rest? It is found from the year 1534 to the year 1553; i.e. from the year in which it was granted by 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, to the year before that in which it was abrogated by 1 Philip and Mary, c. 8. It is never found after that date. Does it not follow that the title in question did by Act of Parliament belong to our Sovereigns from A.D. 1534 to A.D. 1553, and not before or afterwards?

Queen Elizabeth gave her reasons for refusing to revive it, and Bishop Jewel has handed them down to us; 'The Queen is not willing to be styled in speech or in writing the Head of the English Church; for she says forcibly that that dignity has been given to Christ alone, and is not suitable for any mortal: moreover, that those titles have been so foully defiled by Antichrist, that they cannot be piously employed by any one for the future.'<sup>1</sup> And in a like spirit King James I.: 'It is certain that the Apostles thought none worthy of this honour (the title *Caput fidei*) but Christ; therefore this kind of title ought to have been abstained from, for whose dignity Christ alone is sufficient.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xiv. ad Bulling., May 22, 1559. Zurich Letters, First Series, Camb. 1842. England and Rome, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> Apol. pro Jur. Fidelitatis.

But offensive as the name is, we utterly deny that it ever bore, or was intended to bear, the signification which Mr. Wilberforce attaches to it. He says that 'the ground on which it was important' was, that 'it implied that the Bishops, who stood to Henry 'in the relation of subjects, were combined *by that circumstance* 'into a body, or spiritual entity' (p. 228). Bishop Gardiner is an authority which Mr. Wilberforce ought to accept. He gives the reason for the title, the adoption of which he warmly advocated, thus: 'Since the Church of England is at this day composed of 'the same persons, as are signified under the word Kingdom, of 'whom the prince is the head, when they are termed the Kingdom of England, shall he not be the head of *the same persons* 'when they are called the Church of England?' And Cranmer, as is well known, declared that Nero was Head of the Church in the same sense as Henry; 'for Nero was Head of 'the Church, that is, in worldly respects, of the temporal bodies 'of men of whom the Church consisteth.'<sup>2</sup> Mr. Wilberforce will scarcely say that Cranmer held that Nero combined SS. Peter and Paul and the other Roman disciples into a spiritual entity. The real meaning of the title, ill-chosen and offensive as it is, and indeed only accepted at all by the Church with a reservation which Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges to have made it nugatory, was no more (except perhaps in the tyrant Henry's own acceptance,) than Supreme Governor; and the meaning of that name has already been given in the words both of the Church and of the Crown.

The attempt to fasten on Bramhall the doctrine that 'the powers thus possessed by the Crown,' (*i.e.* the powers by which the Churches were combined into a spiritual entity, &c.) 'were transferred to it from the Papacy' (p. 229), is an act of daring which we think might have been spared. Mr. Wilberforce is able to bring forward half a sentence, which, when removed from its context, might be so understood. It is as follows:—

'Whatsoever power our laws did divest the Pope of, they invested the king with it.' [There Mr. Wilberforce stops. Bramhall does not: he says] —'They invested the king with it; but they never invested the king with any spiritual power or jurisdiction; witness the injunctions of Elizabeth, witness the public articles of our Church, witness the professions of King James, witness all our statutes themselves, wherein all the parts of papal power are enumerated which are taken away, his "encroachments," his "usurpations," his "oaths," his "collations, provisions, pensions, tenths, first-fruits, reservations, palls, unions, commendams, exemptions, dispensations of all kinds, confirmations, licences, faculties, suspensions, appeals," and God knoweth how many pecuniary artifices more—but of them all there is not one that concerneth jurisdiction purely spiritual, or which is an essential right of

<sup>1</sup> De Ver. Obed. foll. 9, 11. England and Rome, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> Fox xi. vol. iii. p. 550, Ed. 1684. England and Rome, p. 87.

the power of the Keys; they are all branches of the external regiment of the Church; the greater part of them usurped from the Crown, sundry of them from Bishops, and some found out by the Popes themselves.—*Schism Guarded*, vol. ii. p. 458. Oxf 1842.

In truth, this whole matter about combining the Churches into a spiritual body is infinitely unreasonable. Who combined the Churches of Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, and the other Churches planted by S. Paul, into 'spiritual entities?' Who combined S. John and the Ephesian clergy into a body? Was it Linus? or had S. John no powers of mission, jurisdiction and other functions, because the Ephesian Church had not 'crystallized' properly? How came the seven Churches of Asia to be bodies? What made the Patriarchate of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, &c., into entities? What made the thirteen Diocesan Churches have powers to rule themselves? How came the second Œcumenical Council to be so ignorant of the true principles of ecclesiastical 'crystallization,' as to order that, 'according to the canons,' the Bishops of Egypt, the East, Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, should severally and independently manage each their own affairs? What made the African Church into a body, whose letter to Pope Celestine (in which its members are forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to appeal beyond the seas and out of the realm of Africa) is the very anticipation of 24 Henry VIII. c. 12? One answer alone can be given to these and similar questions. They are combined into spiritual entities by their union with their one Head, the Lord Christ. Neither the Catholic Church of the early ages, nor the Anglican Church of the sixteenth century, regarded either the Bishop of Rome or the king of a country as the centre of unity, and the means of combining Christians into bodies. They held that the Churches of great cities and districts were independent of each other, and yet united to each other, by all depending alike upon the one Head, Jesus Christ; by being all bound together with the one bond of the Holy Spirit; by being all ruled by the one code of laws which found their expression in the canons of the Œcumenical Councils: but not cramped into the form of an ecclesiastical monarchy, under the rule of an earthly King-Bishop—not requiring, as of necessity, any organization superior to that of Bishops who are spiritually and ecclesiastically equal in powers and in functions, whether they are situated 'at Rome or at Engubium.'

It would take us too long to follow Mr. Wilberforce through his discussion of the state of the early British Church, and the acts of the Reformation, and unwind the threads of accuracy

and inaccuracy which are enfolded and entangled together. We shall but touch upon two more points; these are, Mr. Wilberforce's way of dealing with the Gorham case, and with the Greek Church. As to the merits of the first, we shall, of course, not here say one word; we shall only compare two passages, to see if there is to be found that 'just balance' which has been declared to be God's 'delight.'

'The Church hath authority in controversies of faith.' 'The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies.' This view of the Church of England, as claiming authority over the consciences, was dissipated by the Gorham case. It then became manifest that neither the rulers of the English Church, nor the Church herself in her corporate capacity, exert any such power, or claim to act on any such principles. . . . And this decision resulted from the further fact, that the civil power had taken possession, with the Church's assent, of her spiritual organs; her courts professed themselves bound to affirm or deny according as the temporal Sovereignty ordered them; and cannot claim, therefore, to be the expression of that mind of the Spirit which utters its voice through the body mystical of the Son of God.'—P. 217.

Such is the measure meted out to the Church of England. Now compare the following passage:—

'The Donatists, after having been heard by Melchiades, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 313, and again by the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, obtained a personal hearing, A.D. 316, from Constantine. He heard them unwillingly, and avowed that he had no proper jurisdiction, but as he only confirmed that which had been decided by the Church, no particular evil resulted from the proceeding.'—P. 174.

Now, let the Gorham case be as Mr. Wilberforce represents it, yet, so far as the reference to the civil power goes, what is the difference between the appeal to Constantine in 316, and to Victoria in 1850? That Constantine decided one way or another way matters not; the whole principle is involved in the cause having been carried to him at all. We are not justifying such a course; we think it equally wrong in the case

<sup>1</sup> 'The justice of the decision,' we are further told, 'has been called in question, indeed, by many individuals; but that such questions are to be decided by the civil power, and not by the Church, seems to be acquiesced in on all hands as inevitable' (p. 218). How true this statement is appears from the Clergy Discipline Bill, discussed by the Houses of Convocation at their very last sitting, Friday, Feb. 9, 1855. The Report of the Committee of the House of Bishops contains eighteen paragraphs, of which the 6th, 7th, 8th, 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th are all on this subject. With scarcely a dissentient voice the Church in representation has declared 'that the present provision for hearing and deciding final appeals is not such as to give satisfaction; that 'it is highly important that it should be corrected; that there ought to be 'security that ecclesiastical questions shall be decided by persons qualified by office and by acquaintance with the course of law ecclesiastical to decide them; that the law which assigned the hearing of such causes to the Queen in Council ought to be repealed; that 'the best solution of the difficulty would be . . . to enable her Majesty . . . to remit the cause for rehearing in the Archbishop's Court, to be finally decided by the judge of that court, and other ecclesiastical and common-law judges.' This is acquiescence—acquiescence on all hands!

of Emperor and Queen alike; but what we call attention to is this: that whereas in the one case Mr. Wilberforce sees all claim on the part of the Church to authority in controversies of faith dissipated, the civil power taking possession of the Church's organs, and the mind of the Sovereign substituted for the mind of the Spirit; in the other absolutely similar case he has nothing to say but, that 'no particular evil resulted.'

The Greek Church has always presented a formidable difficulty to the advocates of the Supremacy of the Pope.

'The orthodox Greek or Eastern Church contains a body of Christians reckoned at not less than eighty millions. It is governed by Patriarchs and Bishops, holding their sees in continuous descent from the Apostolic age. It has produced saints, martyrs, and fathers. Since its separation from the West, it has converted the Slavonic race, and added to its body the great Russian Church. It has retained the ancient creed without the change of an iota. It has never gone through the trials and dangers of a Reformation. It has ever spoken, and speaks still, with the voice of unbroken tradition, and it has *never* admitted the Papal sway. It has constantly, in every age, held up its voice and its witness against that claim as Antichristian and blasphemous, which says that "the Pope is set over the whole Christian world; and possesses in its completeness and plenitude that power which Christ left on earth for the good of his Church."<sup>1</sup> It has denied this, and any like claim, not merely for 300 years, but from the time that it has been advanced.'—*Papal Supremacy*, &c. p. 59.

Mr. Wilberforce feels the difficulty; and how does he meet it? He dismisses the whole question in a page and a half, with an *argumentum ad hominem* to the effect that the Anglican Church is not in communion with the Greek Church. Very true; but that was not the thing asserted, nor the thing which is needed for the argument. The controversial use, so to speak, which is made of the Greek Church by the Anglican Churchman is, to show in and by it that the Bishop of Rome is not the monarch of the Church, with whom to be in union is to hold communion with the Catholic Church. What reply to this argument is it to say, 'Oh! but you are not in communion with the Greek Church?' It does not touch the question in hand. But there are some striking admissions in the page and a half devoted to the Greek Church.

'However effective may be its testimony against the Church of Rome, its witness on behalf of the Church of England amounts to nothing. So that though it may be an useful weapon for those who deny that any such thing exists as Church authority, it cannot be relied on by those who desire to construct any system of belief, or hope to see any positive opinions prevail among mankind. Such seems the natural result of the three following considerations:—1st. The main doctrinal opposition between the Greek Church and the Church of Rome, respects the procession of the Holy Ghost; now on this point the Church of England is committed to the

<sup>1</sup> Bellarmine, De Pont. Rom. lib. i. c. 9.

self-same principles as the Church of Rome. . . . 2ndly. As the Church of England is opposed to Greece, in that particular in which Greece is most opposed to Rome, so in all those points of doctrine in which she is opposed to Rome, she is equally opposed to Greece. For there is hardly a tenet in which she has departed from the popular creed of the Western Church, in which the Eastern Church would not condemn her. How can we profess to be in communion then with the Eastern Church, when the Easterns agree with Rome respecting those very doctrines [the Supremacy for instance?] which the Church of England has been disputing for the last three centuries? 3rdly. There is a Bishop resident in the East who is called the Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem. . . . How then can it be said that the Church of England is in communion with the Church of Greece any more than with that of Rome? So that whatever use may be made of the Greek Church as a weapon against an opponent, it is useless for the purpose of justifying ourselves. Those who believe that God has His Church in the world, and that its purpose is to teach truth, will not be satisfied with arguments which are simply destructive, and which result only in the overthrow of all authority.'—P. 271.

Why Mr. Wilberforce should have asserted that 'in all those points of doctrine in which the Church of England is opposed to Rome, she is equally opposed to Greece,' we cannot presume to guess. Every one knows that it is not the case. All our readers probably are aware that on the doctrine of Purgatory, on the doctrine of Indulgences, on the doctrine of Communion in one kind only, on the doctrine of the Worship of Images, on the doctrine of the Celibacy of the Clergy, on the doctrine of the Free use of the Holy Scriptures, on the doctrine of Church Services in a tongue 'not understood of the people,' and on many other doctrines, among which is to be specially counted the doctrine of Roman or Papal Supremacy, the Greek and the Anglican Churches agree in testifying or protesting against the innovations of Rome.<sup>1</sup> But we pass by this point, and we will say no more about the *ignratio elenchi* exhibited throughout the reference to the Greek Church. What we say

<sup>1</sup> The very last authoritative document of the Oriental Church, the Evangelical Letter put forth by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, in the year 1848, declares that the Papacy is the *great heresy* of later times, as Arianism of earlier ages; having ceased to be 'purely guided by the doctrines of the Fathers, and to walk by the never-to-be-forgotten rule of the Scriptures.' 'What then,' ask the Patriarchs of the East, 'must we conclude of those who pride and boast themselves only upon their succession to the supposed chair of S. Peter? . . . It is easy to discern the emptiness and the weakness of the attempts by which the Bishop of Rome endeavours to maintain his despotic power. For if the Church of Christ had not been founded upon the indissoluble rock of the Confession of Peter, which was a common answer, as from each individual of the Apostles, to the question that was asked of all, "But whom do ye say that I am?" (as the godly Fathers both of the East and West interpret the place), it would have been built upon a frail foundation, and upon Cephas *personally*,—still, however, not in any sense on the Pope; and yet it is he who, moreover, appropriates to himself the Keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and what kind of use he has made of them is only too manifest from history.' *Ἐγκύκλιος τῆς μιᾶς ὁλῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἐπιστολή*.—p. 19. Quoted in an excellent article in the first Number of the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*.



is this. Mr. Wilberforce declares that the authority of the Greek Church 'may be an useful weapon for those who deny that any such thing exists as Church authority: it cannot be relied upon by those who desire to construct *any system of belief*, or hope to see *any positive opinions* prevail among mankind,' that 'those who believe that God has His Church in the world, and that its purpose is to teach truth, will not be satisfied with arguments which are *simply destructive*, and which result only in the *overthrow of all authority*.' But Mr. Wilberforce is not merely arguing against the Church of England,—he is constructing *some system of belief*; he does believe in *some Church authority*. Then he ought manfully to have grappled with this fact which is 'simply destructive' of all authority, and not to have slurred it over as incapable of meeting it. But the fact is, that Mr. Wilberforce has here made an exaggeration. It is not *every* system of belief, nor *every* positive opinion, nor *all* authority, which is overthrown by the argument derived from the existence of the Greek Church. This is clear; for the Greek Church itself has a system of belief, and holds positive opinions, and maintains Church authority, and yet is not overthrown by its own existence. Rather it is one particular system of belief and set of positive opinions, one particular mode of Church authority,—viz. that which energizes through the Papal power, which, indeed, Mr. Wilberforce has throughout the latter half of his volume been attempting to confuse with *all* Church authority,—of which the argument derived from the existence of the Greek Church is 'simply destructive.' Thus limited, we accept and ratify the admission. The existence of the Oriental Church is, indeed, 'simply destructive' of the Papal theory, and the argument derived from it 'results in the overthrow of all authority,' as it is claimed by Rome. This being so, it is the part of 'those who believe that God has His Church in the world,' and 'that any such thing exists as Church authority,' to adopt a theory which is not 'overthrown' by facts, but will account for them. Such is the theory of Church authority maintained by the Anglican Church.

We shall conclude this point with an extract from the *résumé* of 'Papal Supremacy,' &c.:—

'This doctrine of the Supremacy was unknown to—1. The ancient Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon; which set before us another and distinct system of Church government, viz. the Diocesan or Patriarchal. 2. The ancient Liturgies, the depositories of Apostolic traditions; which also set before us the Patriarchal government of the Church. 3. The ancient Fathers; who neither in their interpretation of Scripture attribute a Supremacy to S. Peter, as modern Roman controversialists do, nor by their acts and writings acknowledge a Supremacy in the Bishop of Rome. S. Peter has with them the Primacy, the first place among the

Apostles; but it is distinctly and repeatedly denied, that he had any authority over the other Apostles, or any peculiar gifts or commission above the rest. And the Bishop of Rome stands foremost amongst his equal brother-Patriarchs. 4. The growth of the modern Roman Supremacy may be distinctly traced. It grew up chiefly under the shadow of a vast system of forgeries, which imposed on the whole Western Church for 700 years. 5. The Eastern Church, with its four Patriarchates, never submitted to the Roman Supremacy, but has continued its unbroken witness against the usurpation to the present day. 6. Our fathers, maintaining the Canon of the Church, rejected the Supremacy of the Pope as a usurpation, and not of lawful right. We conclude, that the sin of schism cannot, and does not, rest with us who lawfully maintain the ancient Canon and discipline of the Church. The guilt must be theirs who require unlawful terms of obedience.—P. 67.

There is one final point on which we must say a few words. How is it that men like him whose book we have been reviewing,—men of honoured and respected name, and of general candour and integrity—can allow themselves, as soon as they undertake to reconcile Antiquity and Papal Supremacy, to make use of such shifts as we have had to exhibit, to wrest and torture words in the way we have had to expose, and so to misrepresent antiquity (there is no other word for it), as we have seen in the case of S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, Hilary the Deacon, Eusebius, the Council of Sardica, the Council of Ephesus, and the Council of Chalcedon? The charitable hypothesis of second-hand quotations taken from manuals of Theology will not meet the case, for the writer has evidently an acquaintance with original works: nor can it be the deadening effect of Liguorian principles, for he has not been educated in them. The only manner of accounting for this phenomenon is that which has lucidly been expounded by one who has since acted in the way which he has himself described:—

‘Now do I mean to accuse so serious and good a man as Bellarmine of wilful unfairness in this procedure? No. Yet it is difficult to enter into the state of mind under which he was led into it. However we explain it, so much is clear, that the Fathers are only so far of use in the eyes of Romanists as they prove the Roman doctrines. and in no sense are allowed to interfere with the conclusion which their Church has adopted; that they are of authority when they seem to agree with Rome, of none if they differ. . . . A Romanist, then, cannot really argue in defence of the Roman doctrines; he has too firm a confidence in their truth, if he is sincere in his profession, to enable him critically to adjust the due weight to be given to this or that evidence. He assumes his Church’s conclusion as true, and the facts or witnesses which he adduces are rather brought to receive an interpretation than to furnish a proof. . . . Let us then understand the position of the Romanists towards us; they do not really argue from the Fathers, though they seem to do so. They may affect to do so in our behalf, happy, if by an innocent stratagem they are able to convert us; but all the while, in their own feelings, they are taking a far higher position. . . . They claim and use all documents of antiquity as ministers and organs of that one Infallible Church, which once forsooth kept silence, but since has spoken;

which by a Divine gift must ever be consistent with herself, and which bears with her own evidence of Divinity.'—*Proph. Office*, p. 84.

When Mr. Wilberforce wrote his 'Inquiry into the Principles of Church Authority,' it is clear that he had already adopted this principle of interpreting antiquity by the authority of the modern Church, or, rather of one portion of the modern Church, instead of testing the modern Church by an appeal to antiquity. He was, therefore, unable to deal fairly by antiquity; and thus the individual is to a considerable degree exculpated, —at the expense, however, of his adopted system, which, in proportion as the individual is excused, is itself more deeply criminated.

---

ART. V. 1.—*A Scripture Argument against permitting Marriage with a Wife's Sister—a Clergyman's Letter to a Friend.* By the REV. JAMES AUGUSTUS HESSEY, D.C.L., &c. &c. Second Edition. London: F. & J. Rivington. 1850.

2.—*The Report of Her Majesty's Commission on the Laws of Marriage, relative to Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, examined in a Letter to Sir Robert Harry Inglis, Bart. M.P.* By ALEX. J. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P. Second Edition. London: James Ridgway, Piccadilly. 1849.

3.—*Against Profane Dealing with Holy Matrimony, &c. &c.* By the REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A. Vicar of Hursley. Oxford: John Henry Parker. 1849.

WE intend here to institute a short inquiry into the grounds upon which marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which it is proposed now to legalise, has been declared to be contrary to the law of God—and we are induced to enter upon this subject by two reasons: 1stly, because we feel that, even if the minds of many are already settled upon the point, yet there may be some to whom a calm consideration of the matter may perchance minister satisfaction and relief, and some whose doubts we may be enabled in some degree to resolve—and, 2dly, because the leading advocates of the change proposed, profess an unwillingness to promote or sanction any act which can be clearly shown to be contrary to the law of God, as revealed in holy Scripture, and as still binding upon Christians.<sup>1</sup> The point upon which many minds are at issue is not, whether they should obey or disobey God; but firstly, whether God has really declared His will in opposition to such unions; and secondly, whether such a declaratory law, even if found in holy Scripture, was not simply part of the Levitical law, and so binding upon Jews alone as Jews, but is now abrogated, as regards Christians, and of no further force or validity.

Till this question is decided, it would seem that all other arguments in favour of a change, whether they have reference to an assumed expediency or propriety in such a change, or whether they be drawn from that most fallacious of all sources, the example of a multitude, are beside the mark and premature. For it is time then at length to inquire into the force and

<sup>1</sup> In page ix. of Report of Commission on Marriage, quoted by Mr. Beresford Hope in page 5, 'Some persons contend that these marriages are forbidden, expressly or inferentially, by Scripture. If this opinion be admitted, *cadit questio*.'

character of all such further arguments, when it has been demonstrated clearly and certainly, either that God has not spoken at all, or that He has even allowed, or at least not forbidden, such marriages.

The subject then, with which we propose to deal, is concerned with the two following questions:—

1st. Is the law of God, as revealed in holy Scripture, opposed or not to such marriages?

2d. If it is so opposed, is such a law to be regarded as merely Levitical, or as binding upon all men?

Now, before entering more particularly into the discussion of the first point of our intended inquiry, we may perhaps be allowed to remark as Churchmen, and as addressing mainly Church-readers, that our Church *has* spoken to her members plainly and authoritatively upon the subject:—first, in the Table of Prohibited Degrees, set forth by authority in 1563; and, secondly, by Canon xcix of 1603, which orders that Table to be set up in every church, and characterises it as containing ‘degrees prohibited by the law of God.’

We see, then, that according to the view taken by our Church in the times of James I., and of our Reformers, (who framed that Table,) in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, these marriages were opposed to the law of God. We shall hereafter attempt to show that such also was the opinion, not only of the Christian Church from the earliest times, but of Jewish Rabbins and interpreters.

Upon what passages of holy Scripture then, it may be asked, was such a general opinion and consent grounded? What passages can we find which bear at all upon this point?

Now all parties in this discussion, whether they resist or advocate the change, seem to agree in referring to Lev. xviii. as to that part of Holy Writ, which, if any, has reference to the question in dispute: the one part deducing arguments from the clause contained in verses 7—17 inclusive; the other part depending upon verse 18, as even containing an argument for the lawfulness of such marriages.

For the meaning of Lev. xviii. verses 7—17, as for the general argument which we shall have to state at length, we shall make frequent reference to the very able pamphlet, put forth by Dr. Hessey in 1850, which we have placed at the head of this article, and we avail ourselves of this opportunity, once for all, of recommending to the thoughtful perusal of all, who may be anxious to see in a clear argument what can be said upon this subject, so satisfactory and valuable a document.

Dr. Hessey, after having quoted at length the passage under consideration, tests by it each member contained in the Table of

Prohibited Degrees, and shows how every one of the connexions there forbidden is denounced either in express terms or by implication and converse analogy in the words of Holy Writ.

We say, then, with Dr. Hessey, that in ver. 16 is contained the declaration of God against marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and deduce our proof in this way: we find in that verse a prohibition against a man's marriage with his brother's wife—*i. e.* a woman may not marry two brothers; and analogously, (for the relationship is of a corresponding character in both cases,) a man may not marry two sisters, therefore not his wife's sister.<sup>1</sup>

Now it is to be remarked that, for the establishment of this proof, *two* assumptions have been made; viz., 1, the law of analogous inference as applicable to the case; and 2. the relationship of affinity as binding the persons concerned equally with the bond of consanguinity.

Some have objected to this mode of arguing, and have assumed that no prohibition ought to stand good but that which is laid down in so many words. Let us again follow Dr. Hessey's lead, and see into what difficulties and inconsistencies such an objection, if allowed to be good, would conduct us. He takes in illustration two cases similar to the one in dispute, and shows that it is only by inference, and not by direct words, that an uncle may not marry his niece, nor even a father his daughter:

'Those, therefore, who will admit nothing but what is set down in so many words to be Scripture, are brought to this—they must either allow all these inferences, or none of them.'—P. 11.

Besides,

'There is another strong reason for the admission of inferences. The prohibitions on the woman's side of the table are all of them of this character. The restrictions upon marriage in the chapter of Leviticus are addressed to men. We *infer* the woman's side from what is *said* to men.'—P. 11.

It really does seem to us unaccountably strange, that any objection should be raised, or seriously entertained, against the validity of such a law of inference, as applicable to the chapter or the case which is now especially under our notice; when not only the directions contained in this chapter, but the whole Law given by Moses, (except in two or three cases which especially relate to the female sex,)—and may we not add, not only the Law given by Moses, but *every* general code of laws?—has its provisions addressed to *men*, and only to *women* by inference through the other sex. And if this indeed be the rule, why should we feel any especial difficulty in admitting the application

<sup>1</sup> By a similar line of argument, the marriage of a man with his wife's niece is forbidden in ver. 14—the other class of marriage, the legalisation of which is being attempted by the Bill now before the House of Commons.



of that rule to the present case, or in considering that the prohibition contained in ver. 16, against marrying a brother's wife, is really looked at, as is usual, from the man's point of view, and is equally conclusive against the correlative marriage; viz., with a wife's sister; that is to say, a man may not take his brother's wife, *therefore* a woman may not take her sister's husband?

So much then we say in answer to the objection which has been entertained by some against the argument from analogy. In reply to the second objection raised against affinity as occupying a like position with consanguinity in the matters of marriage, we shall do no more than refer our readers to the mysterious language of holy Scripture, in which husband and wife are represented as made one in and by marriage—'one flesh'—united with each other by a higher and closer bond of connexion than even that of blood, and in each other united also with every one who is bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh.

The law of God in the chapter before us treats unions by consanguinity or affinity in the same way, as standing on the same ground;<sup>1</sup> and it is worthy of remark, that the only two cases of incest which are mentioned in the New Testament, viz. those of Herod, S. Mark vi. 18, and the guilty Corinthian, 1 Cor. v. 1, are cases of connexion by affinity. Mr. Beresford Hope's searching Review of the Report made by the Commission, appointed in 1847 to inquire into the laws of marriage, which we have placed with Dr. Hessey's and Mr. Keble's pamphlets at the head of this article, as containing much valuable information with respect to the character of the evidence which was brought before the Commissioners, throws some light upon the opinions which were held by the various witnesses upon this question of affinity. We would call attention especially to the evidence of Archdeacons Sinclair, p. 92, and Hale, pp. 94—96, and to the petition of the Clergy of Down, Connor, and Dro-more, pp. 150, 151, as confirming our own view of the matter, and quote the words of Mr. Beresford Hope himself as corroborative of the same position. In remarking upon a case men-

<sup>1</sup> We may perhaps be allowed here to refer our readers to Mr. Keble's tract, published in 1849, under the title, 'Against Profane Dealing with Holy Matrimony,' where he speaks as follows upon this point:—"Here, (i. e. in the verses 7—17 of Lev. xviii.) are thirteen cases in all; six of kindred by blood, and seven of kindred by marriage; and neither by the order in which they follow one another, nor by any difference of expression regarding them, is any hint given, that the one sort of profanation is less heinous in God's sight than the other. The world may come to think there is a difference, because the world will not believe that man and wife are really one flesh. But the written law of God apparently deals with both alike."  
—P. 13.

tioned in the evidence, in which union of a man with his wife's mother was charged in the Law Courts as incestuous, he says—

‘It may be obtuseness or obliquity of moral feeling on my part, but I confess that I cannot understand why, marrying a wife's mother being acknowledgedly incestuous, there can be so little harm in marrying a wife's sister. The permissibility of the latter alliance must rest upon marriage not creating a relationship between the husband and the wife's family, similar to that existing between him and his own—on him and his wife not being “one flesh” in this sense. If marriage does create such relationship, it would be hardly credible that so near a relation as the sister of her who is “one flesh” with one, could be a person with whom a marriage could, without loss of purity, be contracted. But, on the other side, if such a relationship is not created, where is the pollution of an alliance with your wife's mother, a woman no way connected with you by blood? Either both must be, as far as I can understand, lawful, or both unlawful.’—P. 90.

If then we may in fairness, as all hold that in some cases we must, allow of the argument from analogy—if affinity does indeed unite man with man by ties which correspond with the bonds of blood-relationship, as the constant interpretation of holy Scripture would lead us to believe—then in Lev. xviii. 16 is contained virtually a declaration of the great God of all the families of the earth against marriage with a wife's sister—a declaration, which, except it be proved either to have been qualified by any other subsequent law, or to have been intended for Jews alone, and so to have become abrogated as regards Christians, must be held to be still of divine force and obligation.

It will be seen that we have qualified our conclusion by two supposed or supposable exceptions. They are not altogether imaginary ones, but have been, we fear, causes instrumental in attaching a large number of too-willing adherents to that party which is promoting, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, the abrogation of a law which we, in common with our forefathers, hold to be divine. They are exceptions which have often been brought forward, we have too much reason to fear, to suggest doubts to wavering minds about the real truth of the case, or to allay scruples with respect to a line of conduct which, while passion or inclination prompted them to adopt, conscience hesitated to believe to be after all the right course. We believe that many, who have been led to enter into such incestuous and unholy unions, have perhaps been induced to take the final step upon the representation and with the hope that such marriages, though contrary to the laws of England, nevertheless either were sanctioned by Lev. xviii. 18, or were perhaps part only of the Levitical law, and had so passed away with the Jewish economy.

We know that some, even amongst the clergy, have been kept back from vigorously opposing the introduction of the proposed change, by a latent feeling that though forbidden alike by the laws

of the land and of the Church, yet, as regards their prohibition in holy Scripture and validity amongst Christians, the incestuous character of such unions may be after all but one member of that large class of so-called 'open questions,' which threatens to engulf so many of the most hallowed and precious doctrines of our faith.

We should, therefore, have given a very incomplete view of the whole subject if we did not proceed to show, not only that in Lev. xviii. 16 we have a Divine law prohibitory,—but that this law is not invalidated or affected by ver. 18, nor addressed even to Jews as a Levitical but as a moral law. The discussion of these two points will lead us, therefore, to the completion of the line of argument which was laid down by us at the beginning of this article: the first objection bringing into view the investigation of the other part of Lev. xviii., which has been alleged as bearing favourably upon the change proposed; the second objection directing us to the second great branch of our subject, which has reference to the proper weight of the scriptural argument as applied to the present time.

What, then, is the fair interpretation of Lev. xviii. 18?

We here, again, agree with Dr. Hessey, that though this verse may have been frequently quoted and used as bearing upon the point at issue, it has really, upon investigation, nothing to do with the matter. We believe, and shall endeavour to show, that ver. 18 has a probable reference to bigamy or polygamy, and to nothing else.

Our reasons for this assertion are as follows:—

1st. *From the order of prohibitions* in the chapter.

Now from ver. 6—17 we have one class, and one class only, referred to, viz. marriages amongst persons already connected by *consanguinity or affinity*, introduced by the general heading in ver. 6: 'None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him.'

Passing by ver. 18 for the present, we find in ver. 19 another sort of prohibition; in verses 20, 21, cases of adultery, (i.) literal, (ii.) spiritual, *i.e.* idolatry; in verses 22, 23, cases of unnatural crimes.

Now it is to be observed, that one case remains unnoticed in a catalogue of forbidden unions, that of 'bigamy' or 'polygamy;' and where, humanly speaking, would its natural place be in the scale but between verses 17 and 20, where, in fact, we find a prohibition which seems, even at first sight, obviously to refer to this sin? That it really does so refer to 'bigamy' we shall see some probable reason for believing, when we inquire into the passage more in detail.

To this interpretation, derived from the contents of the



'I am a brother to dragons:' or by *merely partaking of the same nature*, as a man to a man, Lev. xix. 17: or, lastly, *generally by expressing likeness*, as Prov. xviii. 9, and Ezek. xviii. 10.<sup>1</sup>

Hence we see that the word is used in the masculine in the very vaguest sense. Are we, then, to assert positively that (πῶς) 'sister' in the feminine, *must* mean in this passage 'sister' in its strictest sense? or may we not fairly suppose, (except indeed, as is not the case here, the context definitely fixes the meaning to this restricted sense,) that the same vagueness which at times, and in fact most frequently, belongs to the masculine form, is capable of application to the feminine form also; so that 'sister' may mean 'one woman in relation to any other woman,' even as we saw above that 'brother' actually is used, in the *very next chapter* of Leviticus, to mean a man in relation to his fellow-man?—even as we have the word ἀδελφή used in the New Testament (1 Cor. ix. 5),<sup>2</sup> similarly with its masculine form, ἀδελφός?

But we are not left entirely to doubt and conjecture with regard to this use; for, i. we believe that we are right in saying, after a careful examination of the Pentateuch, that in no one instance throughout the laws given by Moses (except, indeed, it be in the passage before us) is either 'brother' or 'sister' used in its restricted sense, for relations by blood or kin, without a clue to this definite meaning being at the same time furnished by the context; and ii. in truth, the phrase here used, 'a woman to her sister' must, in strict propriety, be taken as a whole, and seems to have been a proverbial expression, meaning simply 'one to another.' Our marginal reading witnesses to this fact, where we find, for the words in the text, the passage rendered as follows: 'one wife to another,' with a reference to Exod. xxvi. 3, where we have the very same phrase twice, as applying to inanimate things, *the curtains of the tabernacle* coupled 'one to another,' i. e. in the Hebrew,<sup>3</sup> 'a woman to her sister;' and again, Ezek. i. 9 uses the very same expression for the *wings of the cherubim*, 'joined one to another,' in ver. 23, 'one toward the other,' and in chap. iii. 13, 'one another.' Nor is this proverbial mode of expression found in the feminine alone; but, when so used, it is simply the equivalent phrase (used where

<sup>1</sup> Ezek. xviii. 10: 'If he beget a son that is a robber, a shedder of blood, or doeth the like to any of these things,' where, in margin, 'to his brother any of these things,' but rather, perhaps, more accurately, 'the brother of any of these things.'

<sup>2</sup> Μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν δέουσαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιγεῖν, &c. Compare with this expression the title given by the bridegroom to the bride in the Song of Solomon, 'My sister, my spouse,' iv. 9, 10, 12; v. 1.

<sup>3</sup> אחותה פיה. The same phrase occurs in three other places in the chapter, and is translated differently in each place, viz. in ver. 5, 'one of another,' in ver. 6, 'simply together,' and in ver. 17, 'one against another.'

the nouns with which it is connected are of the feminine form) for a corresponding masculine form, 'a man to his brother,' 'a man and his brother,' which occurs no less than twenty-one times in the Hebrew Bible, and is translated in all cases except one (Ezek. xxxiii. 31, where 'brother' appears) by the same indefinite words, 'one—another.' And it is further not unimportant to remark, that of these twenty-one instances no less than thirteen occur in the books of Moses, and three in Ezekiel (the very parts of Holy Scripture in which alone the feminine equivalent above-mentioned is found); that in only three instances does it refer to those who were in point of fact brothers (Gen. xxxviii. 19; xlii. 21, 28), and in two cases it is used (as the feminine form in Exod. xxvi. 3) with reference to inanimate objects, *the faces of the cherubims* 'one to another.' Exod. xxv. 20 and xxxvii. 9.

Here, then, we have an expression occurring in the masculine and feminine forms, according as it is joined with masculine or feminine nouns, no less than thirty times in the Bible, and in twenty-nine cases used in the same vague and indefinite way. Shall we then assert that in the thirtieth instance (viz. in Lev. xviii. 18), and in that alone, the indefinite *must* become definite, and the phrase drop its general character?

We think that with such an overwhelming preponderance of evidence in favour of our interpretation, we might safely use the strongest expressions to declare our conviction of its truth; but this we will boldly assert, that, to say the least, no stress of *necessity* can be laid upon the English word 'sister' here used, as implying any more than the relation in which any one woman stands to any other woman: and we think that we are not without every show of reason on our side, when we assert that the passage would seem to have no reference to the marriage with a wife's sister, but rather to the sin of 'bigamy,' or 'multiplying wives.'

2d. We proceed now, secondly, to the reason given for the prohibition, which, it is to be remarked, is of an entirely different character from those which preceded. It is not now 'because she is thy sister,' i.e. by affinity as wife's sister, nor 'because she is thy kinswoman,' nor 'because it is wickedness,' reasons which apply to the foregoing cases,—but 'to vex her.'

The Hebrew word נָסָה (an intensive form of the simple verb נָסָה) seems to be used in all cases for 'greatly afflicting or distressing,' as Numb. xxv. 17, 'Vex the Midianites,' in punishment for their enticing Israel into sin. Diodati (quoted by Parkhurst) renders the word here used by 'per esser la sua rivale,' which shows at least his sense of the reason of the prohibition. The same word is used in a substantive form in 1 Sam. i. 6, a passage



which has a very strong bearing upon this verse, where Peninnah, one of the wives of Elkanah, is said to be 'an adversary' to Hannah, and we know how, as her 'adversary' or 'rival,' she provoked her sore for to make her fret.<sup>1</sup>

The use, too, of the Hellenistic word ἀντίζηλος in this passage as equivalent to the Hebrew נָא, is well worth observing.

It is employed twice in the same sense in the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, and in both cases with reference to one woman as the rival of another, xxvi. 6. ἄλγος καρδίας καὶ πένθος μέγα γύνη ἀντίζηλος ἐπὶ γυναικί, and again in xxxvii. 10, 11, μὴ βουλεύου . . . μετὰ γυναικὸς περὶ ἀντίζήλου αὐτῆς.

We may, perhaps, be allowed to add in illustration from the *Mishna* of the Jews, that the several wives (or concubines) of a man are called נָא, (literally 'troubles') to each other, 'inasmuch as,' Kimchi observes in his commentary on 1 Sam. i. 6 (the passage before referred to), 'they are most often sources of trouble, jealousy, and vexation.'

We infer, then, from the foregoing observations, that the reason given for the prohibition confirms our interpretation of the meaning of the word 'sister,' and of the character of the whole verse.

3d. But if the reason of the prohibition remained doubtful, the doubt would be cleared away by the limit of time which is added: 'beside the other in her lifetime.' It is only during the lifetime of the first wife that a second wife added can be a vexation and trouble to her; hence 'bigamy' is the sin prohibited by the verse: but at the death of the first wife, the man is free to marry again,—yet not, as some have tried to make the verse to imply, free even now to marry the sister of his former wife: for that relationship has been already forbidden by the terms of the 16th verse, and the sister of the deceased wife remains as much a sister by all the ties of affinity after the death of her sister, as she was during her lifetime.<sup>2</sup>

We say, then, in concluding our inquiry into the scriptural argument as deduced from Lev. xviii. that ver. 18 has no

<sup>1</sup> The word 'adversary' in Hebrew, נָא, is a substantive form connected with the verb נָא, 'to vex,' used in Lev. xviii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> An objection may be supposed to lie against the above interpretation of Lev. xviii. 18, as if polygamy was permitted by God in Deut. xxi. 15, but we should conceive it to be just as difficult to extract from the last-named passage a Divine sanction for such a practice, as to derive from Deut. xvii. 14—20, an approval of the conduct of the Israelites in after times in choosing a king. Both passages, in fact, seem to occupy similar ground, as providing rules which were to be observed when, as the Lord who knew the hardness of their hearts foresaw, the special occasions which would require the application of such rules should arrive. We may further observe, that Deut. xxi. 15 stands in the midst of a series of rules of conduct, to be observed under difficult circumstances, and after improper acts. See Deut. xxi. 1, 10, 18, 22.

bearing upon the question at issue, but refers to a different class of prohibitions; and that in ver. 16 is contained virtually a specific declaration of the Divine will in prohibition of such marriages. We assert that neither at the same time nor in succession is a man permitted by the law of God to take in marriage *two* sisters: and we ground our reasoning upon the two arguments of analogy and affinity.

Nor is this any novel method of interpretation; for we shall be enabled to show, (and we would fain hope in a way which will prove satisfactory to our readers,) that it is from ver. 16 and in reliance upon *these arguments*, that not only our Church, but the early Church, and the Jews themselves, have asserted and laid down the rule hitherto observed as of Divine authority.

Beginning with our own Church authors, we shall trace back the recognition of this law in the early Church, and then by reference to Jewish authorities show how, as matter of fact, modern and ancient Churches, Christians and Jews, have, often unwittingly to each other, agreed in one common belief and practice on this point.

We have already referred to the Table of Prohibited Degrees set forth in 1563, and to the Ninety-ninth Canon, (which establishes that Table as based on warrant of holy Scripture,) as authoritative exponents of the mind of our Church-rulers in the reigns of Elizabeth and James.

We shall bring forward Wheatley as our first witness, because he has explained at great clearness and length the way in which that Table is to be viewed and interpreted. In his 'Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer' he writes as follows:—

'It may not be amiss to observe that several degrees are expressed in the Table which are not mentioned particularly in the 18th of Leviticus, *which is the place upon which the Table is founded*. But then they may be inferred by *parity of reason*. For that passage in Leviticus only mentions those relations evidently and expressly which may help us to discover the like difference and degrees. So that for the right understanding of the 18th of Leviticus, and to bring it to an agreement with the Table in our Common Prayer Books, we must observe *two particular rules* for our direction:—

'1. That the same prohibitions that are made to one sex are undoubtedly understood and implied to the other.

'2. That a man and his wife are accounted *one* flesh: (so that whoever is related to one of them by means of consanguinity is in the same degree related to the other by means of affinity, insomuch that the husband is so much forbid to marry with his wife's relations, and the wife with her husband's, within the degrees prohibited, as either of them are to marry with their own.) Thus, for instance, though *marrying a wife's sister* be not expressly forbid in the 18th of Leviticus, yet by parity of reason it is virtually implied. For when God there commands (ver. 16) that a man shall not marry his brother's wife,—which is the same as forbidding the woman to be married to her husband's brother,—it follows of course that a man is also forbid to marry his wife's sister; for between one man and two sisters, and

one woman and two brothers, is the same analogy and proportion.'—*Wheatley, Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer, London, 1840, p. 396.*

He then proceeds to show that in like manner, as we have seen above, a man is forbidden to marry his deceased wife's niece, and to refer to the decision of our Law Courts, which we shall mention more at length presently.

These observations of Wheatley are grounded upon the *Reformatio Legum* (A.D. 1553), quoted by Gibson in his *Codex*, vol. i. p. 498, from which, in fact, Wheatley's remarks are a literal translation. Gibson in referring to the original words says:—

'Upon the foregoing rule, from parity of reason (which we also find to be acknowledged and laid down by the Books of Common Law) rests the prohibition against marrying a wife's sister, which I cannot better explain than in the words of Bishop Jewel, in his printed letter upon that point:—"Albeit I be not forbidden by plain words to marry my wife's sister, yet am I forbidden to do so by other words, which by exposition are plain enough. For when God commands me, I shall not marry my brother's wife, it follows directly by the same that he forbids me to marry my wife's sister. For between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers, is like analogy and proportion."'

The letter, of which the above extract forms part, seems to have been written in A.D. 1561, about the time when Archbishop Parker, lately advanced to the See of Canterbury, had issued his admonition against unlawful marriages, amongst the provisions of which we find, 'Fratris uxorem ducendi, vel duobus sororibus conjungendi, licentiam penitus submovemus.' (Strype, Parker, vol. i. pp. 174, 175. Oxford Edition.)

In the Lambeth Articles of the same year we also find the following rule laid down:—

'It is agreed that all such marriages as have been contracted within the Levitical degrees be dissolved, and namely those who have married two sisters one after another, who are, by common consent, judged to be within the case.'—*Cardwell, Doc. Ann. i. 267.*

These particulars have an especial bearing upon our inquiry, as showing the mind of the Church Reformers at that period; for it must be borne in mind that no longer time than two years elapsed after the letter of Jewel, before the Table of Prohibited Degrees was published by Archbishop Parker in 1563. In the

<sup>1</sup> The whole letter, from which the above is an extract, is printed in Strype, (Parker, vol. iii. pp. 55—58. App. No. XIX. Oxford edition.) It was written in answer to an inquiry made to him upon the legitimacy of such marriages, which appear to have become prevalent during the disorders of those times, and seem to have been considered allowable by some foreigners, (he mentions Pellicanus, Paulus, Fagius and Lyra,) who took Lev. xviii. 18 strictly. This view he condemns, and then proceeds to show the necessity of the argument from analogy, adding after the words quoted by Gibson, 'And other such like ought to be taken for a rule. And therefore the Rabbins of the Jews have expressly forbidden divers degrees by this rule, which God by plain words forbade not.' See also Le Bas' Life of Jewel, chap. v. pp. 101—104.

year following, viz. 1563-4, we have the contents of this Table called 'Leviticall Degrees,' and their observance enjoined by the 'Book of Advertisements,' where we read:—

'Item, That no persons be suffered to marye within the Leviticall Degrees, mentioned in a Table set forthe by the Archebysshoppe of Caunterburye in that behalfe, A.D. 1563, and if any suche be, to be separated by order of lawe.'

And again, in 1571, the Table was enforced in similar language by *Canons*, amongst which we again find particular stress laid upon the marriage which is under consideration:—

'*Omnia matrimonia quæ uspiam contracta sunt intra gradus cognationis aut affinitatis<sup>1</sup> prohibitos in xviii. Levitici autoritate Episcopi dissolventur: maxime vero, si quis priore uxore demortuâ, ejus sororem uxorem duxerit: hic enim gradus communi doctorum virorum consensu et judicio putatur in Levitico prohiberi.*'—*Sparrow, Coll. p. 240.*

We find further from Gibson, that the question of marriage with a wife's sister came under consideration in the King's Bench (25 Car. II. Mich. Term. Hill v. Good):—

'Though it was alleged that the precept, *primâ facie*, seemed to be only against having two sisters *at the same time*, and prohibition to the Spiritual Court was granted; yet in Trinity Term, 26 Car. II. after hearing civilians, they granted a consultation as in a matter within this statute, 32 Henry VIII. though the former statute (25 Henry VIII.) had never been revived after the repeal of Queen Mary, which yet it *virtually* was, and there, as in 25 Henry VIII., the wife's sister is expressly prohibited.'

We are here referred further back to the reign of Henry VIII., when it is to be carefully observed that a distinction was made between the degrees prohibited in Leviticus, and those additional degrees which the Church before the Reformation had herself imposed.<sup>2</sup> The former as binding by the Word of God

<sup>1</sup> The joint prohibition against consanguinity and affinity here referred to, was declared in the admonitions prefixed to Parker's Table:—

'II. It is also to be noted that consanguinity and affinity (letting and dissolving matrimony) is contracted as well in them and by them which be of kindred by the one side, as in and by them which be kindred by both sides.

'III. Item, that by the laws consanguinity and affinity (letting and dissolving matrimony) is contracted as well by unlawful company of man and woman as by lawful marriage.'

The Visitation Articles of Cardinal Pole, in 1557, hold the same language, where he makes inquiry, 'Whether any be married in the degrees of affinity or consanguinity prohibited by the laws of Holy Church?'—Cardwell, Doc. Ann. i. 174. And Dr. Burn witnesses to the same fact, when, after referring to the 'Levitical degrees' and 'prohibited degrees,' mentioned in the Acts of the 25th and 32d of Henry VIII., he adds, 'The degrees specified in these statutes are particularly set forth in Leviticus xviii., whereby not only degrees of kindred and consanguinity, but degrees of affinity and alliance, do hinder matrimony.' (Ecol. Law. Phill. ii. 440.)

<sup>2</sup> By the Act of 25 Henry VIII. restriction was taken off all degrees of consanguinity or affinity, except those which were *condemned in express words* in Lev. xviii. The impropriety and evil consequences of such a course were seen at the time by Cranmer, who, by a letter addressed two years afterwards to Cromwell, and quoted by Cardwell (Doc. Ann. i. 282), seems to have remonstrated at the

were retained, the latter as imposed by man, and, therefore, within the power of man to abrogate, were set aside.

Having traced the opinion of our Church to the very time of its Reformation, we would now refer our readers several centuries backward to the times of the early Church. We find in Western Christendom, the Council of Auxerre, (Conc. Antissiod.) A.D. 578, laying down these *analogous* Canons, and so showing the ground of Scripture upon which its view was based:—

‘Can. xxix. Non licet ut *relictam fratris sui quis in matrimonium ducat.*

‘Can. xxx. Non licet, duas sorores, si *una mortua fuerit*, alteram in conjugium accipere.’

The brother's widow and the sister's widowed husband are placed on a similar footing; in the latter Canon, Lev. xviii. 18 is evidently ignored. A like rule appears to have been laid down in the Eastern Church, for in the *Codex Theodosianus*, lib. iii. tit. xii. *de incestis nuptiis*, we find a law of Theodosius Junior, the Emperor, in the fifth century, which conveys a similar prohibition. And in this case we may remark, that Honorius, the fellow-emperor of Theodosius, had at this very time married two sisters, daughters of Stilicho, successively, the one after the other. The law runs thus (leg. iv.):—

‘*Tanquam incestum commiserit, habeatur qui post prioris conjugis amissionem sororem ejus in matrimonium proprium crediderit sortiendum. Pari ac simili ratione etiam si qua post interitum mariti in germani ejus nuptias crediderit adspirandum.*

A law of Constantius, bearing date of the preceding century, quoted also in the *Codex Theodosianus*, must be referred to in common fairness, as it seems to imply that some had thought themselves at liberty to enter into such unions in previous times. Its words are (leg. iii.):—

‘*Etsi licitum veteres crediderunt, nuptiis fratris solutis, ducere fratris uxorem: licitum etiam post mortem mulieris vel divortium contrahere*

time of the passing of the Act, though to no purpose. His words are, ‘By the law of God many persons be prohibited which be not expressed, but be understood by like prohibition in equal degree. As S. Ambrose saith, that the niece is forbid by the law of God, although it be not expressed in Leviticus that the uncle shall not marry the niece. But when the nephew is forbid there that he shall not marry his aunt, by the same is understood that the niece shall not be married unto her uncle. Likewise as the daughter is not there plainly expressed, yet when the son is forbid to marry his mother, it is understood that the daughter may not be married to her father, because they be of like degree . . . . And as touching the Act of Parliament concerning the degrees prohibited by God's law, they be not so plainly set forth as I would they were. Wherein I somewhat spake my mind at the making of the said law, but it was not then accepted’ (Strype's Cranmer, i. 66). Dr. Cardwell proceeds, ‘These views, and the frequent applications made to the archbishop for dispensations in cases prohibited in principle, but not forbidden by express words in the statute, led eventually to the formation of “The Table of Degrees,” that was set forth by Archbishop Parker.’

cum ejusdem sorore conjugium: abstineant hujusmodi nuptiis universi, nec æstiment posse legitimos liberos ex hoc consorcio procreari, nam spurios esse convenit, qui nascentur.'

It is evident, however, that even this law, though it may seem to favour the idea that marriages of the kind prohibited were previously allowed, shows that the permission of marriage with a wife's sister was deduced by analogy, not from Lev. xviii. 18, but from Deut. xxv. 5—10, which contains a provision in exception to Lev. xviii. 16; and, perhaps, even thus it may have followed, from a mistaken idea that the Levitical law, which for certain temporal purposes abrogated in certain cases the law laid down in Lev. xviii. 16, was still allowed to Christians; and if so, that its converse was also allowable. But however this may be, we have another contemporaneous law in another part of the Eastern Church, which speaks plainly upon the matter as it stood then.

S. Basil, A.D. 370, having fixed a penance of fifteen years as the punishment for adultery, lays down the same law for those who have contracted such a marriage as that with two sisters successively:—

'Can. lxxviii. 'Ο αὐτὸς κρατεῖται τύπος καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν λαμβανόντων εἰς συνοικέσιον, εἰ καὶ κατὰ διαφόρους χρόνους.'

Passing to even an earlier period, and to a different Church-region, we find the Council of Illiberis (A.D. 307) determining, though in milder form than suited the monk Basil, the punishment for the same offence: Conc. Illib. Canon lxi. :—

'Si quis post obitum uxoris suæ sororem ejus duxerit, quinquennium à communione placuit abstinere, nisi forte dari pacem velocius necessitas coegerit infirmitatis.'

And once more, to quote one of the earliest, if not the earliest, code of Church laws, the Apostol. Canons, dating probably from the third century at the latest, denounce against the same sin, the prohibition from the hope of becoming a cleric:—

Can. xviii. 'Ο δύο ἀδελφῶς ἀγαγόμενος, ἡ ἀδελφιδὴν, οὐ δύναται εἶναι κληρικός.

'The same evil mark,' as Mr. Keble in his Tract, p. 22, remarks, 'which in the 13th and 14th Canons of the same series is' set 'upon bigamy, and upon other discreditable marriages, and in 'the 53d upon all kinds of unchastity.'

We have thus, at the risk of wearying our readers, given a sort of catena of Church authorities up to the earliest ages of Christianity. But we have not even yet finished our task, and must ask their patience for a further space, whilst we lay before them some evidence in proof that not only Christians of all ages have thus looked upon this question, but that Jewish Rabbins also, to whom Jewel alluded in the letter which we quoted above, both took the same view of holy Scripture, and



based it upon the same grounds of analogy and affinity. It is interesting, and we believe that it will be found useful to see, if we can, how as a matter of fact the Jews of old, often notoriously lax in their observance of the severer parts of the Law, regarded these matters.

Our first reference will be to Maimonides, a learned Spanish Rabbín of the twelfth century, who, in his celebrated book, entitled, 'The Reasons of the Laws of Moses,' thus writes upon prohibited marriages (p. 310):—

'Reasons of a similar nature existed also for the prohibition of incestuous marriages (Lev. xviii.); for the persons forbidden to be married to each other being such as usually lived together in the same house, opportunity for criminality would be easily found, and, though associating with each other, the judge could not have separated them from each other; so that if such persons could have married like others who were free and disengaged, and no punishment had been affixed to their marriage, the greater part of men would have been living in a state of constant unchastity.<sup>1</sup>

'Another reason for prohibiting such marriages, I apprehend, was to commend modesty and chastity. For such an union betwixt the *root* and the *branch* is the most glaring profligacy; for instance, for a man to marry his mother or daughter; therefore, marriage betwixt *root* and *branch* was forbidden. Nor does it constitute any difference whether the *root* marry the *branch*, or the *branch* the *root*, or whether they meet in marriage with a third person, as when any one marries both *root* and *branch*. On this account a man was forbidden to marry a woman and her daughter, or the wife of the father and the wife of the son, because these were marriages to *root* and *branch*.

'*Brothers* were considered as *root* and *branch*, and it was therefore forbidden to marry a *wife's sister* and a *brother's wife*, because this was uniting two individuals to a third person, who were, as it were, *root* and *branch*. Besides, since marriage among brothers was considered as *root* and *branch*, and even as one body, and was therefore forbidden, it was likewise forbidden to marry a mother's sister, because she was regarded as being the same as a mother; and a father's sister, who was considered as near as a father.'

So far Maimonides, whom we have quoted at some length, in order that the whole view in which this matter was regarded by him might be laid in its entirety before the reader. We may remark, however, that it is clear throughout, that he considers the connexion between individuals by marriage to be as effectual a bar to marriage as connexion by blood. His arguments may be thus briefly summed up: Brothers are forbidden to marry the same third person, because the husband's brother becomes by marriage as a brother to the wife. Therefore, sisters are forbidden to marry the same third person; because, in like manner, the wife's sister becomes by marriage as a sister to the husband.

<sup>1</sup> Our reference is to an English translation by Dr. Townley (published A.D. 1827), Chap. xxiv. p. 310, &c. 'Precepts of the 14th Class.'

<sup>2</sup> We cannot but commend this paragraph to the notice of those who would take up the social part of the subject.

Nor was this view of holy Scripture any mere invention of Maimonides, or of the Jews of his age, for the *Mishna* (which professes to give the oral law delivered by tradition from Moses, and is at least as old as the time of Rabbi Judah, who lived about A.D. 150) bears witness, though incidentally, and so with more force than if it had been of set purpose, to this interpretation of God's law; for we read in Book xxii., entitled 'Yebamoth,' which treats of the obligation under the Law to marry a deceased brother's wife (Yeboom), and so to preserve his name and family, that there were certain circumstances which were ruled by the Rabbins (whether rightly or wrongly does not affect the question, which is merely one of fact) to render such an observance of the Law unlawful; as, for instance, 'if the parties were related to each other within the degree of 'consanguinity prohibited by the holy Law to intermarry.'

Chapter I. gives instances of such prohibitions. Fifteen classes of women are mentioned, who, on this ground, release themselves from this obligation, and amongst these we find the 12th case in order to be this, 'When the widow of the deceased is his (*i.e.* the surviving brother's) wife's sister.' In that case the law of Levirage was considered not to apply.

But the *Mishna* does not leave us with this general interpretation of the Law; it supplies us with cases in illustration of its actual working. Case 1, from chap. iii. §. 7.—

'When of three brothers, two are married to two sisters, and one to a stranger: if one of them who married the sisters died, and he who had married the stranger marries the widow; and then the wife of the second brother dies, and also the third brother, who had married the stranger; then the widow will be for ever prohibited to the second or surviving brother, because she was for some time prohibited to him [as wife's sister].'

That is, in other words, inasmuch as her sister had by her marriage brought her into connexion of affinity with the man, she can never afterwards be clear from such bond of affinity, and, therefore, *even after her sister's death*, remains as a sister to him.

Or, to make the matter clearer:—Three brothers, A, B and C, marry respectively M and N, two sisters, and S, a stranger. A dies, and C marries the widow M: then N dies, and also C, who leaves behind S and M; then B may marry S, but not M, because she was sister to his former wife N.

Case 2 is similar. (§. 9, at the end):—

'When of two brothers married to two sisters, one dies, and afterwards the wife of the surviving brother also dies, then he may not marry his brother's widow, because there was a time when she was prohibited to him [namely, during the life of his wife, her sister].'

<sup>1</sup> Our references are to the English translation of the *Mishna*, by 'De Sola and Raphall.' London: 1845.

To exemplify as before. Two brothers, A and B, marry respectively M and N, two sisters. A and N die; then B cannot marry M, because she is the sister of his former wife.

So strongly, then, did the Jews consider the prohibition *upon the warrant of God's law* as binding, that they even made it an exception to the fulfilment of that other particular provision, which, it may be observed, was permissive, and not obligatory, with respect to the 'raising up seed to a brother.' The latter gave way before, when it was found to clash with, the former law. Why, we may ask, was this? Was it not, because they judged that the one was a temporary and individual law, binding upon an Israelite as such, whilst the other was a moral and a general law of God, which bound by its provisions not Israelites alone, but all men. And this consideration naturally leads to that second question, which we laid down at the beginning of this article as necessary to be discussed: viz.—whether if, as we have attempted to show, holy Scripture has spoken in the way in which Christians and Jews have believed that it has spoken,—in denunciation of the marriage with a wife's sister,—such a law be not, after all, a law Levitical, not moral—a law for Jews, but not for Christians. A few words will be all which we shall deem it necessary to employ in answer to this objection, and we again avail ourselves of Dr. Hessey's pamphlet (pp. 4, 5):—

'1stly. The Israelites are warned at the commencement of Lev. xviii. against practising the abominations of the Egyptians and the Canaanites, (ver. 3); and the warning is repeated even more solemnly, so far as the Canaanites are concerned, at the conclusion of the chapter.' Now, neither of these nations could have transgressed the Jewish political law. It had not yet been laid down; and if it had, they had possessed no opportunity of becoming acquainted with it. Of course, therefore, they could not have been condemned or punished for transgressing it. Still they are condemned for transgressing the precepts mentioned in the chapter. These precepts, then, must be the reenactment of the principles of God's moral law, which those nations might have known, and which they could and did transgress.

'2dly. If the chapter relates to the Jewish political law at all, it must relate to it entirely. No distinction is discoverable in it by which the moral and political precepts can be separated. If some of them be political, all must be political, and therefore all must be abrogated, which no one will venture to affirm. If some of them be moral, all must be moral, and, therefore, all must be still binding upon Christians.

'3dly. Until nearly the end of the fifteenth century, the Church held the precepts of this chapter which relate to marriage to be moral, and, therefore, not to be tampered with or reversed. And the most ancient table of

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xviii. 24, 25. 'Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things; for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled; therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.' . . . ver. 30. 'Therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance, that ye commit not any one of these abominable customs, which were committed before you, and that ye defile not yourselves therein: I am the Lord your God.'

prohibited degrees, founded upon the chapter, was virtually the same as our own. I may add that the first recorded instance of any one of these degrees being dispensed with, took place towards the end of the fifteenth century, under one of the most infamous popes who ever filled the papal chair. It is true, that from the sixth to the fifteenth century the table of forbidden degrees was much extended; and it is true, also, that the degrees thus added beyond Scripture were frequently dispensed with. But they were dispensed with on the ground that they were merely ecclesiastical, not Scriptural, prohibitions; whilst the degrees in our table were never dispensed with, on the very ground that they were moral precepts, and part of the unalterable Divine law.

'I conclude, therefore, that Lev. xviii. is part of the moral law, and, therefore, binding upon Christians.'

What, then, we have tried to show is, that there is solid ground for believing that God has spoken, and spoken emphatically, in Lev. xviii. 16, against the marriages which it is now proposed to legalise. We have attempted to make it probable, that no Divine permission or allowance is to be deduced in favour of a change in the law from Lev. xviii. 18.

We have further argued that the laws laid down in that chapter were not so much Levitical as moral, binding on Jews, yet not as Jews, but as men—social, moral, religious beings—laws which have a force independent of the Jewish Law, which were in being before that Law was given, which continue equally in being ever since the requirements of that Law have passed away. We have adduced evidence to show that the arguments employed in our proof are such as have ever been held to be sound and valid, both by Jew and Christian,—as well by the early Church as by our own Church since the Reformation,—and have been the grounds upon which the belief and practice of ages have rested.

We would, in conclusion, ask our readers to weigh well the considerations which have been brought before their notice. If there be any to whose minds we have failed to bring entire conviction, to them we would beg leave to say, If your minds are still doubtful, if there be but a secret feeling that at least there is probability, though there may not be certainty, on our side, remember the words of Butler:<sup>1</sup>—

'In questions of difficulty, or such as are thought so, where more satisfactory evidence is not to be had, or is not seen: if the result of examination be, that there appears upon the whole, any the lowest presumption on one side, and none on the other, or a greater presumption on one side, though in the lowest degree greater; this determines the question, even in matters of speculation; and in matters of practice will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation, in point of prudence and of interest, to act upon that presumption or low probability, though it be so low as to leave the mind in very great doubt which is the truth. For surely a man is as really bound in prudence to do what upon the whole appears, according

<sup>1</sup> Butler's Analogy. Introduction, pp. xlix. l. London: 1841.

to the best of his judgment, to be for his happiness, as what he certainly knows to be so. Nay, further, in *questions of great consequence* a reasonable man will think it concerns him to remark lower probabilities and presumptions than these; such as amount to no more than showing one side of a question to be as supposable and credible as the other; nay, such as but amount to much less even than this.'

Consider the sides between which you have to choose, on the one hand, the preservation of the present law, with the probability of being on God's side, and on the other, the change in the law, with the chance of standing in opposition to the law of God. Add to the weight, in the former scale, the united voice and opinion of the wise and good of past ages, and your line of conduct can no longer remain doubtful.

---

## NOTICES.

Two 'Catechetical Manuals,' and both bearing the authorship of Ramsay, reach us. The one is Dean Ramsay's (of Edinburgh), which in its seventh edition (Grant), may be supposed to have acquired a dignified elevation beyond the range of criticism. We should not ourselves have assisted to place it in so lofty a position, for we think it coldly correct as far as it goes, which is only about half-way, and heavy.—Mr. Arthur Ramsay, of Trinity College, Cambridge, in his 'Catechiser's Manual,' (Macmillan,) has given us a much more original and thoughtful work; his favourite study is etymology, and some of his little notes on the meaning of words in the Catechism are instructive and important. His taste for these verbal refinements is occasionally overdone: and we were surprised (p. 44) at Mr. Ramsay's adoption of Dr. Donaldson's apparent inversion of the use of the word 'gossip.' He seems to say that the word was used for a sponsor, because it signified, 'the most intimate and friendly conversation.' Whereas, being the technical name for a sponsor—God-sip—it came to be applied to vain and trifling talk, on account of the habit to which such affinities gave rise of indulging in familiar intercourses.

The author of 'Forest Scenes in Norway and Sweden,' (Routledge,) has not in the fishing-jacket of former years disqualified himself for the cassock of his present life, as his useful 'Sermons' and 'Guide to Confirmation' show. Mr. Newland, like Walton and Donne, is a fisher of men as well as of salmon. In either character he writes with entire good sense: and his love of anecdote and keen appreciation of character make him agreeable both as a tourist and a preacher. The 'Forest Life' contains more about the Scandinavian social and religious state than most professed volumes of travel. All that Mr. Newland writes flows agreeably.

'An Oxford M. A.' has sent us a pathetic appeal in favour of 'Public Nurseries.' (J. H. Parker.) What is to be said for and against infant schools—and the moral argument is not all on one side—applies to this scheme. It is at work in Portugal Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields; and its beneficial results on the child are unquestionable; that it throws the mother into an unnatural, if unavoidable, condition, is perhaps as plain.

We are glad to welcome the tenth part of the second volume of 'Instrumenta Ecclesiastica,' (Van Voorst,) a useful set of working drawings, published by the Ecclesiological Society. A list of tradesmen of whom the various articles may be procured would be found useful, particularly to colonial church builders.

Mr. J. H. Parker's 'Scripture Prints'—especially the glazed copies—are a vast improvement on our extant stock. But what is wanted for cottage walls is colour; and the Christian artist who would supplant the ugly but intelligible daubs which, both here and abroad, find such favour with the poor, by good and religious coloured designs, would be a benefactor of no small value. The thing is not impossible, though difficult. Uneducated



eyes are incapable of understanding miniature reproductions of the great Italian master-pieces; the style of fresco, and its broad masses of powerful colour, are alone suited for the common mind.

The 'Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology' (Macmillan) improves as it advances. The third number is the best, though its predecessors were of high promise. The English school of classical criticism is reviving.

Two volumes of Calvin's French Letters have been collected and published by M. Jules Bonnet, from the Archives of Geneva: 'Lettres de Jean Calvin.' (Paris: Meyrueis.) They form a supplement to the well-known Latin Letters, and the chief value of the present collection is, that they are from a recent collation, and form a complete series. The most valuable portion of M. Bonnet's volumes, Calvin's correspondence with M. de Falais, has been long before the world, and the letters on English ecclesiastical affairs are familiar to all students of the Reformation period. The new letters amount to about a hundred and seventy: they confirm occasionally what we had already ample evidence of, that Calvin possessed a remarkable repertory of brutal language. In the way of a contribution to history, we do not detect much value in the new matter which M. Bonnet's pious care has disinterred from the congenial dust of the Library at Geneva; and perhaps the fame of the burner of Servetus had been better consulted, had Calvin's encomiasts withheld this additional proof of their hero's disregard of decency, and proficiency in the vulgar tongue. We pluck, quite at random, a florilegium of Christian and evangelical exhortation: 'Ceste malheureuse beste Orry,' vol. i. p. 373. 'Nous faisons trop d'honneur à ces bestes connues de les appeler évesques . . . ce brigant qui a occupé le siège de Dieu,' *ibid.* p. 353. 'Ceste beste sauvaige,' vol. ii. p. 16. 'Ceste beste venimeuse,' *ibid.* p. 19. We find that it is by no fault of the gentle Calvin that Servetus and Gentilis had not many companions at the stake and on the scaffold. Writing to a lady, Madame de Cany, we find Calvin expressing the following amiable regrets with respect to an earlier victim: 'Je vous assure, Madame, s'il ne fust si tost eschappé, que, pour m'acquitter de mon devoir, il n'eust pas tenu à moy qu'il ne fust passé par le feu.' Vol. i. p. 336. The present Editor may well express his curiosity about the person who evoked, to use his own euphemistic language, 'Ces paroles empreintes de l'âpre rigueur du réformateur?' John Calvin, however, has his consolations: he thinks that the God of mercy will accept the will for the deed. He and his pleasant lady correspondent find a pious hope in the belief, 'Toutefois si le bien que nous taschons de faire n'adresse comme il seroit à désirer, c'est bien assez que Dieu accepte nostre service,' *ibid.* At vol. i. p. 69, note, we find M. Bonnet repeating Beza's foolish fanfaronade of Calvin's volunteering his services to attend the plague patients in 1542. Mr. Dyer, in his recent 'Life of Calvin,' has proved incontestably that Calvin, in common with the whole body of ministers, exhibited the greatest reluctance to attend the hospital and visit the sick; and it was on this occasion, although Calvin had contrived to get a vote from the council keeping him at home, because he was wanted to serve in the church, that the ministers 'refused to repair to the hospital, and said they would rather go to the devil.' On this occasion, 'Calvin

'and his brother ministers appearing before the council on the subject, were dismissed with the significant resolution, "Resolved: To pray to God to give the ministers more constancy in future." At vol. ii. p. 461, we find a curious letter of reproof to a certain minister, Desprès, who had celebrated a marriage between a man and his deceased wife's sister: Calvin remarks, 'Quant au fait en soi, Luther estoit encores assez novice et mal exercé en l'Ecriture, quand il fait le sermon que vous alléguez. Nous avons esté esbahis de l'annotation qu'on a mise sur le 18 du Lévitique.'

We have received from Mr. Van Voorst what we presume is a reissue of his famous edition of the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' with Mulready's illustrations. Many gift-books have appeared since this publication; but taking into account both the especial suitableness of this the most popular fiction in the English language, the powers of the illustrator, combining both delicacy of touch and poetry of conception, and the dignity as well as grace with which the wood has been cut by Mr. Thompson, we think that on the whole the volume may be taken as a model of English attainments, literary and artistic. Mulready's illustrations recall Hogarth's suggestive fulness without his coarseness, and, what is rare in art, they show that the grotesque need not degenerate into caricature. In their truthfulness of conception and honest scrupulous execution, every line cut as sharply as in an etching, the woodcuts are little short of perfection.

In 'A Guide to the Parish Church,' (Deighton & Bell,) by Mr. Harvey Goodwin, many things are agreeably and characteristically talked over, and persuasively enough recommended. The day *ought* to be past, indeed, and in many quarters is so, for dwelling on divers of the points here discussed at large. The book, in fact, is much in the old-fashioned style of Stanley's 'Faith of a Church-of-England-man.' Is it quite so faithful as books of that date were, to the highest and truest aspects of Christian doctrine? Mr. Goodwin, in his definition of a priest, omits his characteristic and determinative,—the power, viz. of consecrating the Eucharist. In critical points like this, he is always just short enough of the truth to be sure to be popular. In all other respects he well deserves to be so.

Mr. Wigan Harvey, in his two volumes 'On the Creeds,' (J. W. Parker,) has done something more than reproduced the labours of Pearson. The treatise is independent, and in many respects is eminently suited for theological students, who are often deterred from Pearson by the ruggedness of his style. In his theology the present writer is decidedly orthodox; and his Hebrew and Syriac acquirements invest some of his commentaries with unusual interest. The Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds are treated in a combined discussion: the Athanasian Creed receives a separate discussion. Here Mr. Harvey proposes, with sufficient modesty, to assign an earlier origin to this illustrious confession than that assigned to it by Waterland. Hilary of Arles is deposed in favour of Victorius of Rouen; and Mr. Harvey argues that S. Augustine, in the Treatise *de Trinitate*, illustrates the Creed as an older document, Waterland's argument being that the Creed was rather compiled from the Bishop of Hippo's previous teaching. In this latter view, antecedent to other points of criticism, we are disposed

to agree with the present author: it is more probable that a single writer should illustrate a formal and accredited document, rather than that an ecclesiastical symbol should be only a cento from a contemporary, however distinguished, author's works. As to the point of attributing the *Quicumque Vult* to Victoricius, we are unable to accompany Mr. Harvey. It is certain that he was accused of heresy, certain also that he cleared himself of the charge. But Paulinus of Nola, the only evidence appealed to by Mr. Harvey, does not say once that Victoricius published a confession at all. He merely says, writing to Victoricius, 'No doubt you said so and so: 'I feel confident that you agree with me in believing and teaching thus 'and thus.' Paulinus does not even profess to have seen Victoricius' confession, and bears no witness even to its existence: all that he does is to suggest certain language for his correspondent's avowal. We think this slender ground for attributing any published Creed to Victoricius: to connect him with the (so called) Athanasian symbol there is no documentary evidence whatever. Le Brun, the Paris editor of Paulinus, in a particular dissertation on the Life of Victoricius, (Paris, 1685,) gives no intimation whatever that he ever composed a Creed on the occasion of the attacks on his orthodoxy. The question as to the age of the Creed within thirty or forty years is, however, very immaterial. We desire to recommend Mr. Harvey without any hesitation or drawback.

The body of Cambridge writers who are engaged in editing the important series of Ecclesiastical Manuals published by Macmillan, seem to be supplying a need which ought to be recognised by the Universities themselves. It is the *Times* Fund supplementing—as they say—a deficient and ill-arranged commissariat. Mr. Procter's 'History of the Book of Common Prayer' is by far the best commentary extant: somewhat of the credit of this must of course be attributed to the fact that it is the last. It is all but impossible not to improve upon Wheatley with the works of Cardwell, Palmer, Maskell, and Lathbury extant. In availing himself of these sources, Mr. Procter only claims to have epitomized their labours. He has done more. He has harmonized them. Not only do the present illustrations embrace the whole range of original sources indicated by Mr. Palmer, but Mr. Procter compares the present Book of Common Prayer with the Scotch and American Forms; and he frequently sets out in full the Sarum Offices. From the recent Parliamentary paper he gives a full account of the mischief threatened in the abominable suggestions of 1639. It seems an especial indication of a providential care over the future of the English Church, that just as the subject of Liturgical revision or readaptation is presenting itself, our sources of knowledge should be at the same junction so much enlarged. There is not a thoughtful or well-informed Clergyman in England who would not denounce, and be enabled to resist, on intelligent grounds, the sort of haphazard suggestions of twenty years ago. The subject is understood: and as a manual of extensive information, historical and ritual, imbued with sound Church principles, we are entirely satisfied with Mr. Procter's important volume.

Mr. George Hill's pamphlet, 'A Letter to the Rév. Dr. Barrow,' (J. H. Parker,) is intended to show that Queen's College has no right to appoint

the Head of S. Edmund's Hall. It is a difficult matter to prove that a power which has been publicly exercised for some three hundred years, of which the grounds disputed were long ago examined, and decided to be unquestionable, is unfounded; and we must say, we think Mr. Hill has failed in his object. He suggests that the Hall should be incorporated, and the Head appointed by a certain number of the members. Of course, if one Hall has this new constitution, all ought to have it; because the Chancellor's power of appointment is, we apprehend, quite as much an encroachment on Aularian rights as that of a College. Whether such a scheme would answer we should think questionable, and its being an interference with vested interests and the claims of property must prove fatal to it. The general tone of Mr. Hill's pamphlet is excellent, though we think his arguments very weak.

'The Cross and the Dragon,' (Smith, Elder & Co.) is, as far as matter goes, a succinct and, as far as we can judge, a trustworthy account of the early attempts to introduce the Gospel into China. On the whole, Mr. Kesson, its author, is fair; but we fail to discover that he has any very distinct religious sympathies. He pronounces all attempts to evangelize China equal failures; and with intrepid impartiality he looks with equal despair both on Jesuits and Tract Societies. To the former he does some justice, especially on the necessity of some sort of compromise with such strange materials. It is painful to find that Church of England missions find no place in the present writer's review; nor do we anticipate much from Bishop Smith's episcopate. Mr. Kesson dismisses with contempt the notion, much cultivated at May meetings, that the revolt in China had a religious, still less a 'Protestant,' purpose. He attributes it only to the secret societies: and it is much more like a Socialist than a religious movement. Does not Mr. Kesson judge of Buddhism in its most unfavourable aspect, when he selects the Siamese and Chinese developments as its typical forms?

A very unpretending tract, by Mr. Philip Freeman, who has transferred his learning and activity from Chichester to Cumbria, under the title of 'Plain Directions for understanding and using the Morning and Evening Services,' (Edinburgh: Grant,) is really a deep and instructive analysis of the principles implied in the Church's Ritual and Liturgy. It is, we find, and are glad to find, the sketch of a larger and forthcoming treatise on the subject. As sooner or later the revision of, as well as additions to, the extant Services must come before us, Mr. Freeman's labours in showing the deep principles upon which our Offices are constructed are especially well timed.

Reckoning among our readers the Vicareess as well as the Vicar, we desire to introduce with all commendation the work of a lady (S. W.), 'Directions for cutting out and making Articles of Dress,' published by the S.P.C.K. We regret, speaking from our own experience, that needle-work has of late years been too much neglected, and too much mechanically taught, in our national schools. And as we suspect, the visit of the inspector has not a little helped to discourage needle-work. The lady who sends us this little manual has met this necessity of our schools, and

we desire to recommend it. Those in our own confidence—better qualified to speak than ourselves on this subject—assure us, and this after experiment, that we can accredit S. W.'s little manual with entire confidence. It is very intelligibly and sensibly written, in which respect it forms an agreeable contrast to the questions and answers in a publication of the same purpose, 'Plain Needle-work,' (Masters,) one of the Finchley Manuals of Industry, which, however, is also a very useful little work.

The war has called out some poets. Mr. Lushington, of whom we spoke last quarter—the Laureate in verse is not equal to his fame—and one or two clerical bards. Mr. R. Milman, one of a poetic race, has printed 'Inkermann, a poem,' (J. H. Parker,) to which we apply Goldsmith's safe formula of criticism,—the author could have done better if he had taken more pains. Some stanzas—the poem is in a ballad form—of absolute meanness, are more than relieved by other lines, which dash on cheerily with the true war tramp. Mr. Milman seems to have tired of his subject towards the conclusion, which is tame.—'Duty, or the Heroes of Balaklava,' (Masters,) is in blank verse. Considering all the painful controversy and other distresses which are connected with Lord Raglan's famous order, sent to Lord Lucan by Capt. Nolan, it would perhaps surprise the military hero to find, on the authority of H. A., the author of 'Duty,' &c. that it ran in these words:—

'Knights, to the rescue! Ho! advance, and watch  
Each hostile movement. England looks to you!'

—'Christmas Dawn, 1854,' and 'New Year's Eve, 1855,' (Macmillan,) by H. R. F., also in blank verse: pretty, but not above the average.

Mr. Burgon's 'Century of Verses in Memory of Dr. Routh,' (J. H. Parker,) is of a more artistic character. It recalls, and successfully, Tennyson's more domestic—and many think his happier—style. These lines are most truthful:—

..... 'Let me long  
Cherish thy precious mem'ry! long retain  
The image of thy venerable form,  
Stooping beneath its century of years,  
And wrapped in solemn academic robes,  
Cassock, and scarf, and buckles, bands and wig,  
And such a face as none beheld before,  
Save in an ancient frame on college walls,  
And heard of as "the portrait of a great  
And learn'd Divine, who flourish'd years ago."

'Yet would thy sunken eye shine bright as day  
If haply some one touch'd thy favourite theme,—  
The martyr'd monarch's fortunes and his times:  
Yet brighter, if the mem'ries of thy youth  
Were quicken'd into sudden life; but most  
'Twas joy to hear thy solemn voice descant  
Of Fathers, Councils, and the page Divine:  
For then thy words were precious and well weighed,

Oracular with wisdom. Or if men  
 And manners were thy theme,—scholars and wits,  
 The idols of past years,—how rich thy vein!  
 Thy speech how courteous, classical and kind!  
 Each story new, because so wondrous old:  
 And each particular exactly given,  
 The name, the place, the author, yea, the page—  
 Nought was forgotten. “But I tire you, Sir.”  
 (So would he say :) “I fear I tire you, Sir?”  
 An old man, Sir!”—while one’s heart danced for joy.’

‘Arnold’s School Classics, Horatii Opera.’ We can speak in very favourable terms of this edition. It is well adapted for the use of schools. The text is kept free from all matter to which reasonable objection could be made, and the difficulties occurring in it are fully and clearly explained. The introductions to each ode are much to the purpose; while the notes keep the limit of the immediate want in view, giving all that the student could require for the elucidation of the text, but no more. It is an additional recommendation to the edition, that the notes are placed at the end of the volume.

In ‘The Champion, a Course of Lectures on the Temptation,’ (Rivingtons,) Mr. George Richards shows that he has taken a great deal of pains with his subject. He seems to have read very largely before he began to write; and there is consequently more fulness and stuff in his sermons than usual. The style is, we think, stilted.

Broken catechisms are the ordinary apology for idleness in the teacher and cause of ignorance in the taught. Mr. C. J. Heathcote’s ‘It is Written,’ (Rivingtons,) however, illustrates the Catechism from Scripture in such a way that it exercises rather than supersedes the intellectual process. It is for its size the fullest manual which we are acquainted with. Mr. Heathcote, we observe, and the practice is usual, grounds his little book on the Sixth Article. But how does this apply to the necessity of receiving the whole of Scripture? The Sixth Article is entirely negative: it tells us what not to believe, and tells us that Holy Scripture contains all that we have to believe: but what we want in these days is a Fortieth Article, announcing not the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, but the necessity of receiving the whole of it. If, as we are often told, the ‘continent’ of our faith is in the Thirty-nine Articles, it is worth a thought that they say nothing about the inspiration of the Bible.

Mr. Ernest Hawkins has added to his many other services the publication of a very simple and intelligible collection of ‘Family Prayers.’ (Bell & Daldy.) Its object is to give a devotional manual which has no references or complications in it. Its arrangement is one of continuous reading: and, what we much like, there are prayers and intercessions for special purposes.—‘A Manual of Prayers for Working Men,’ (from the same author and publishers,) is among the most practical and intelligible which we have seen.



Protection has found its bard; one who combines both functions of the *eates*. Prophet and poet and priest, Mr. W. Smith Marriott, Rector of Horsmonden, Kent, contrasts 'The Olden and Modern Times,' (Rivingtons,) in some very vigorous antitheses between sundry 'Cotton Lords,' who are the reverend gentleman's abomination, and the

' Olden time,  
Ere mad reform deform'd the clime.'

Here are his views of railway travelling:—

' But then for trav'ling!—How reject  
The wondrous *march of intellect*!  
I grant its speed—but where the view,  
If lovely scenes you *whistle* through?  
Green, red and blue—their colours ope,  
And mix, as in Kaleidoscope.  
I grant its speed—for, scarce begun,  
Your journey seems well nigh half done;  
And ah! too oft, *life's* journey too!  
You race the birds—and *I' crus flew*?  
Now for the Church! '—P. 12.

which we cannot find room for: and now for something else, 'A Tribute to Dorset,' p. 47:—

' Few counties can with Dorset vie  
In ancient aristocracy.  
Her yeomen are an honest race;  
Oh! may they ever know their place!  
Ne'er strive to ape their betters, who  
Despise their claims whene'er they do.  
Ye Yeomen! if ye would be wise,  
Seek not for foreign luxuries,  
Stick to your DOUBLE DORSET BEER,  
And all the world ye need not fear.'

The poet seems to practise what he preaches; for in presenting us with 'A Song sung at the Stanhope Festival, at Maidstone, in 1850,' in which, speaking of poor Lord Stanhope, we are told that

' He loves his country, and he thinks 'tis honest at the core,  
Though there is something rotten in't which makes him very sore.  
The *Peel* is very bad indeed, so bad, that o'er and o'er,  
He says, when *off*, he wishes ne'er to hear it mention'd more,  
Like a fine old English nobleman,' &c. &c.—P. 105.

Mr. Smith Marriott goes on to inform us 'that he was to have presided on this occasion; but though prevented, he had the pleasure of *indicting* the memorial.'—P. 106. This is not the only indictment with which Mr. Smith Marriott ought to be connected: common sense and common decency have a heavy charge against him.

Mr. Alfred Barrett's 'Little Arthur's Latin Primer,' (Longman,) strikes us as both sensible and really useful. A teacher who tells us that 'it is much better to begin with lessons which inspire the pupil with the idea

'that he is above rather than below his work,' and who goes on to say that 'want of confidence in a pupil will terminate in want of power,' is to be trusted.—Mr. Barrett's 'Latin Exercises for the Lowest Form' is a supplementary school-book, and will be found useful in quarters where we are glad to think that the study of Latin—chiefly as a medium of learning universal grammar—is spreading: we mean, in the girls' school-room.

'Historic Notes on the Books of the Old and New Testaments,' by Samuel Sharpe, (Moxon,) ought to be labelled, *Infidelity for the Use of Schools*. In his Preface, the writer observes that he 'avoids the difficult subjects of the inspiration, miracles, prophecies of a Messiah, &c.' One can hardly understand how a subject is avoided by its existence being denied and argued against: for example, the subject of inspiration is scarcely 'avoided,' when it is quietly pronounced that much of the Pentateuch is of the age of Josiah.

'Nicholas Ferrar. Two Lives, by his brother John and by Doctor Jebb,' (Macmillan,) is the first instalment of a series of illustrated biographies, styled 'Cambridge in the Nineteenth Century.' This is an undertaking of large promise; and judging from the first specimen, the promise will be worthily fulfilled. Mr. Mayor is a very accomplished editor: he exhibits immense research, and in the monograph of Ferrar he presents us with the life of a most remarkable person, which has often been told, but never so fully or with such entire sympathy. No minute particular escapes Mr. Mayor's research: it is critical as well as historical; and it quite supersedes Dr. Peckard, Dr. Wordsworth, and Mr. Macdonogh, to say nothing of a better work, Sir George Wheler's 'Protestant Monastery.' Ferrar being dead yet speaketh: and if Gidding Church now reflects the image of days which have thrown a saintly halo around it, and if the estate once more presents a smiling contrast to the neighbouring parishes, all is owing to the impression made on the boyish sympathies of Mr. Hopkinson, the present proprietor, some sixty years ago, by a perusal of Ferrar's Life. The friend of Herbert and Crashaw, the host of King Charles, and one who left behind him such personal witnesses of his holy life as Bishop Williams, Jackson, Bishop Cosin, and Oley, Fuller and Walton, may well leave a memory which it is a singular discredit to Mr. Carlyle to have been almost the only modern to disparage. We may add that the volume is beautifully printed; and it only wants some pictorial illustrations of Gidding and a portrait to make it complete.

'An Inquiry by the light of Scripture into the doctrine of our Lord's Presence in the Holy Communion,' (Rivingtons,) denies 'that there is a real though invisible presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine,' p. 8, and expressly argues 'that our Lord's words cannot be understood in any other than a figurative sense.'—P. 4. To support this view, it is significant enough that the writer is obliged to misquote and falsify the Church's doctrine on the subject. He says, p. 8, 'The Church of England holds that Christ's Body and Blood are in heaven, and cannot be in more than one place at a time.' The Church of England says no such thing; but does say 'the

*natural* Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here ;' but says nothing of the sort of the spiritual or glorified Body.

A vigorous and closely argued 'Apology for Secular Recreations,' (Rivingtons,) appears in the form of a pungent letter to Mr. Close, of Cheltenham. Argument and wit are thrown away in this quarter. It was, we think, Fénelon who put the whole subject in the clearest way. 'You and I, my good friend,' said he to the puritanical, though Papist, *curé*, 'are not called upon to dance on Sunday afternoon ; but the rule for us is 'not the rule for your poor labourers.' And so is it with the secular denouncers of balls and cricket-matches. They aim at a consistent logic, of which the inconsistency is the most glaring, because if really carried out it would compel its advocates one and all to bitter herbs and sackcloth ; and would not only forbid all recreation, but every other life than that of an Egyptian anchorite. The present writer puts this with great point ; and writing from Cheltenham, carries the war into the enemy's country. 'Let me tell you, and the young ladies who follow you, that if they think 'they are safe from vanity and envy because they do not go to balls, and 'that no pursuits can engross or intoxicate the intellect except reading 'novels and plays, they are most fatally mistaken.'—P. 24.

'The Recent Decree on the Immaculate Conception, &c. ; a Sign of the Times,' (Bosworth,) is an 'Irvingite' sermon, 'preached at Albury,' of considerable power. It argues that the decree trenches upon the right belief in the Incarnation. 'If,' says the preacher, 'the Virgin Mary was 'conceived and born without original sin, then Christ did not take upon 'Him the seed of Abraham ; his flesh was not part of our fallen nature, and 'we were not redeemed by Him.' In a sense this objection has its value ; but there are indications throughout the sermon that the body whose opinions it must represent have not yet worked themselves free from the heresy of him by whose name they are known. Edward Irving held the doctrine of the peccability of our Lord's human nature ; and the following passage from this sermon is important :—'It is now more than twenty 'years since a controversy, substantially the same with that which is now 'raised, was brought forward on a different platform and amongst the 'members of other communions than that where it is now discussed. 'Many that are still living remember how great a conflict took place when 'the practical consequences of our Lord's Incarnation were opened and 'set forth by one who has long since fallen asleep in Christ, and who, with 'whatever alloy of imperfection it may have been accompanied, yet bore a 'mighty witness to this fundamental truth.' Is this an avowal, or disavowal, of Irving's specific doctrine ?

In almost all the observations and criticisms to which the recent Report on Church Services, presented to Convocation, has given occasion, we observe, and with thankfulness, a sober and reverential spirit. A pamphlet, under the title, 'What is Convocation going to do for our Church Services ? By a Fellow of a College,' (Oxford : Vincent,) is characterized by the feeling. It deserves reading, not so much for its practical suggestions, which are not many, as for its tone.

The cheap and useful edition of Hume and Smollett, with Hughes' Continuation, published by Bell & Daldy of Fleet Street, goes on regularly. After all, and acknowledging all its defects, Hume maintains a ground which he did something to win.

Mr. Oldknow's 'A Month in Portugal' deserves to take rank with Mr. Meyrick's work on Spain. It is, however, more graphic and ecclesiastical; and contains some curious verses by his fellow-traveller, Mr. Neale.

Such as think the Archbishop of Dublin the Bacon or Selden of the day, will welcome a volume, and another is promised, of 'Detached Thoughts and Apophthegms of Archbishop Whately.' (Blackader.) We do not think so, and therefore we do not treat this collection as of especial value: but that it contains a number of smart and ingenious things cleverly put, there can be no question. A sayer of good sayings, however, if wise, has the greatest reason to complain of this fragmentary exhibition of himself. Few of us would like to be judged by our knuckles, or by a lock of hair.

On the observance of the Sunday question, we have several publications. 1. Abbé Mullois' 'Sunday of the People in France,' translated. (Masters.) A remarkable movement, to which we have already called attention, is going on in Paris, headed by the Clergy, for the better observance of Sunday. —2. 'The Present State of the movement for the Suppression of unnecessary Sunday Trading in London,' (Rivingtons,) is a sequel, and an important one, to a previous publication, 'The Extent, Evils, and Needlessness of Sunday Trading.' —3. 'The Crystal Palace: Reasons for and against the Admission of the Public on Sundays,' (J. H. Parker.) All these publications, the last least so, keep entirely clear of the Sabbatarian view of the Lord's death. We can therefore go with them entirely. What makes us so often hesitate about petitions on this subject is the unfortunate argument which, as many of our readers will remember, and, as the subject increases in importance, all ought to remember, extorted from Thordike the memorable words:—

'The second monstrous imposture is, that the first day of the week, called Sunday, is the Sabbath by the force of the Fourth Commandment: a mistake so gross, that it may well serve for an instance, what faction can do with men that are otherwise sober. That God, by commanding the Jews to keep the seventh day of the week, to wit, that day on which He ended the creation of the world, and for that very reason commanding it, should be thought to command Christians to keep the first day of the week, on which He began the creation, and our Lord Jesus Christ arose from the dead; that is, that the same words of the same commandment in writing should oblige Jews to rest on the Saturday, which oblige Christians to rest on the Sunday, is a thing which, when this fit of frenzy shall be past us, will scarce be believed that ever any man would believe. True it is this first day hath been observed in and ever since the Apostles' time; but not by virtue of that law, which their office was to declare expired and out of date; but by the act of their own authority, whereby they gave laws to Christ's Church.'—*Thorndike, Letter concerning Religion*, § 17. *Works*, vol. v. p. 17. Compare also, *Due Way of composing Dif-*

ferences, § 39. Epilogue, book i. c. xxi. §§ 10—13. Laws of the Church, book iii. c. xxi. § 2. Just Weights and Measures, c. xxiii. § 6.

Mr. R. I. Wilberforce, it seems, has a follower. A pamphlet has appeared, which, excepting its name, (with which we do not charge Mr. Wilberforce,) is little else than a *rechauffé* of his 'Principles of Church Authority.' It is called 'One more Return from Captivity,' written by the Rev. E. S. Foulkes, a late Fellow of Jesus College. We hope, for his sake, that *Return* is a misprint for *Returned*; for that one gentleman should consider himself sufficient to constitute a *return* in his own person, would savour as little of humility as the rest of the title does of sobriety of thought. The greater part of the pamphlet consists of quotations from Mr. Wilberforce, and approval of his sentiments. But Mr. Foulkes is not unacquainted with Ecclesiastical History, and he seems to have found considerable discrepancy between Ecclesiastical History and Mr. Wilberforce's representations of Ecclesiastical History. Accordingly he asks, in a puzzled way, in page 2, 'Can truth be served by distorting facts?' We think not, but, according to Mr. Foulkes' showing, Mr. Wilberforce thinks otherwise; for the former points out that the latter has 'distorted facts' relating to the Council of Sardica, the Council of Ephesus, the Council of Chalcedon, and in respect to the 'Imperial Edicts,' which, 'without doubt, enforced the jurisdiction of the Roman See much more effectually than the Sardinian Canons.'—P. 6. He says, too, truly enough, that 'to hide 'one side of history from view is surely to represent the other unfairly;' and proceeds to point out that Mr. Wilberforce has 'hidden one side of history from view,' in respect to the Second and Third Councils of Constantinople, and with regard to 'the spurious donations of the emperors,' &c. There are, however, other 'distortions of fact,' (p. 20,) and 'concealments of one side of history,' (p. 10,) to which he yields a placid acquiescence; and it would seem that he will not probably long continue to ask uncomfortable questions of this sort, for he has adopted the principle on which history is falsified on 'religious' grounds. Here it is: 'I had traced the historical development of the Papal supremacy over and over again laboriously, but it had never before struck me, that *whether or not it could be proved from history*, it was stamped with the living assent of the 'Universal Church.'—P. 22. Let that principle sink in deeply enough, and Mr. Foulkes' next history (he proclaims himself on his title-page as the author of a Manual) may be as true as M. Rohrbacher's. In p. 35, we find that Mr. Foulkes has been made to take a fearful oath that he will never rejoin the Anglican Church, and to pray before God and the Holy Gospels that he may be damned eternally, if he ever allows 'arguments' to convince him to do so. Those who required him thus to bind his soul with a curse, must have had very little confidence, either in his stedfastness and strength of mind, or in the inherent goodness of their cause, when they thus thought it necessary to guard against the possible and legitimate effects of 'arguments.' 'Should it ever happen,' he was made to say, '(which God forbid) that I should, for any pretext or argument's sake, separate myself from this unity, and incur the crime of perjury, may I fall under the sentence of eternal condemnation, and have my portion

'with the author of schism in the next world! So help me God and these 'His Holy Gospels!' Mr. Foulkes tells us (p. iv.) that he 'contemplates travelling upon a large scale.' We recommend him to go in quest of the Ææan Island, and when he has reached it, to dig for the herb Moly. It may be that, if he dares to walk through the windy mountain-tops of thought (δὲ ἀκρίας ἡνεμοέστρας), the golden-rodded god of speech may vouchsafe even yet to meet him, and point out where it grows.

A little monthly serial, under the title of the 'Old Church Porch,' deserves notice for a course of valuable papers, in which a most respected and competent writer is refuting the claims of Irvingism. We may express a hope that, when this series has been finished, the subject of Mormonism may be treated by the same pen in an equally simple but convincing manner.

Among the very best, perhaps the very best, Bible prints, is a German series in wood-cuts by Schnorr, 'Bibel in Bildern.' They are of a high and dignified school, roughly but not coarsely cut in wood, with the power but not the mannerism of what is known as German art. They tell more than Overbeck's over-refined conceptions, and are frequently as suggestive as Reztisch. Above all, they are very cheap, and for family purposes, not for cottage walls, we know of no successful rivals. They may be had of Williams & Norgate, the English agents.

One of the prettiest as well as most learned and interesting architectural publications which it has been our good fortune for a long time to see, is now in the course of publication in Paris. We refer to the 'Dictionnaire Raisonné de l'Architecture of France,' (Bance,) from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, from the pen and the pencil of that accomplished mediæval architect, M. Viollet le Duc, which is appearing in numbers. As might have been supposed, from the antecedent reputation of the writer, the ecclesiastical department is the most fully treated. Nevertheless, the military architecture of the middle ages is copiously illustrated with a multiplicity of wood-cuts, exhibiting M. Viollet le Duc's peculiar felicity of drawing. The law of the ground-plans of cathedral and collegiate churches is considered under the double aspect of architecture and of ecclesiology, properly so called, while the head '*autel*,' comprising some exquisite illustrations from S. Denis, the Ste. Chapelle, &c. &c., lays down the remarkable fact, that until the period of the Renaissance, altars were never made merely constructional adjuncts, but always preserved the use of a table conjointly.

'Convocation: Remarks on the Bishop of Oxford's Charge.' (Rivingtons.) This is a pamphlet by Dr. Maitland.—'Church Questions: A Letter to a Friend.' (Hatchard.) This is an anonymous pamphlet. Besides the names of their respective publishers, these two little publications fit into each other both by way of contrast and complement. Dr. Maitland is high, and certainly not dry: 'the Writer,' as he signs himself, is as dry as the Zaharah, and as flat. Each of them is decidedly opposed to the revival of Convocation. Dr. Maitland questions 'the existence of any individual who maintains the perfection of our present



'system,' p. 29, and yet declines to introduce formal and authoritative reforms into it. Mr. Hatchard's anonymous scribe, as he sonorously expresses it, 'feels that he is only assuming a fact almost universally acknowledged, when he regards that specific organization of our common Christianity, which has been happily and authoritatively established in this country, as more extensive in its action, as potentially more influential for good, as commanding larger resources, material, substantial and moral, than any other system, indeed than all the other systems of religious machinery in existence.'—P. 3. Dr. Maitland will not hear of Convocation attempting the remedy of the Church's grievances, because with a sarcastic complaisance he reminds the Bishop of Oxford that an active Bishop can do everything that the Church wants in the way of extension. The author of 'Church Questions' will let well alone for the very opposite reason; not because the Bishops do so much, but because happily they have nothing to do: 'it appears to me that the duties of a Bishop, though in the highest degree solemn and important, are not very numerous.' Still each writer makes an exception in favour of his own favourite scheme, or selects his own especial grievance. The letter-writer proposes the sale of the Chancellor's livings: and Dr. Maitland selects 'dilapidations' as one of the two most pressing evils of the Church. We had forgotten. The letter-writer, being, as internal evidence suggests, an incumbent of serene temper and plump proportions, in person and pre-ferment, thinks that the only 'Clergy Discipline Bill' which is wanted, is one which shall compel the Bishop of Exeter to ordain and license certain individuals of the letter-writer's principles. 'Among the questions which would fall within the province of such a court [*i.e.* a court for criminous Bishops] would obviously be that of reviewing the ground on which a Bishop might refuse ordination to a candidate, or a licence to a curate; not that of incompetency, irregularity, or manifest unsoundness in the recognised faith of the Church—on such matters the Bishop must have a discretionary power—but that of a difference of opinion on questions which either the Church has left open, or has decided, through its legal tribunals, in favour of the appellant. It is but little relevant to the question to say that it is not to be supposed that a Bishop can act in a manner to demand such interposition, when it is a fact of more than single occurrence that the Church must have been deprived of the services of men of devoted piety and unimpeachable excellence, if through the wisdom—the *mitis sapientia*—of a superior prelate, the door had not been opened, which had been closed through the wilful perversity of an inferior. It is to the honour of the generally revered prelacy of our Church, and no feeble testimony to the discretion usually employed in their appointment, that there have been comparatively few who could have been justly obnoxious to such a tribunal.'—Pp. 14, 15. Dr. Maitland, with an oversight most extraordinary in one of his sagacity, taunts the Bishop of Oxford with calling attention to the law of clerical discipline as one of the matters requiring the immediate attention of Convocation, because it is a subject on which 'there is not, as far as he knows, much strong feeling in the Church;' and then goes to wonder that 'in these agenda we are not met with the question of the Real Presence ....

'the Gorham case or the Denison case or the Maurice case, not a hint of any attempt to stem the current of blasphemy, or the least suggestion of any opposition to any form or shape of false doctrine, heresy, or schism; no, but Convocation is to sit down in the midst of these *neglecta incendia* to discuss . . . the discipline of criminous clerks.'—P. 24. Has it not occurred to Dr. Maitland that one, and a most important, subject of clerical discipline, is the faith of the clergy, and that any measure of clerical discipline, and any attempt to construct a court of appeal, must in the very first rank place questions of doctrine? *In limine* Dr. Maitland attempts to fasten an error in logic on the Bishop of Oxford. The Bishop had said in his charge, 'The revival of Convocation is spoken of as a party movement, to which we must answer, that this is only so far true, as that it is the movement of *that party* which believes in the Church's life, and seeks for its perfection,' (p. 6,) 'for amongst its adherents are to be found the names of men such as Mr. Kempthorne, identified with the Evangelical party.' On this Dr. Maitland asks, how the fact of the revival of Convocation being advocated by men of both parties 'can be made to prove that those who wrote in that advocacy form an exclusive party, characterised by its believing in 'the Church's life?' which is precisely the inference which the Bishop did not draw. He argues:—'We are called a party; this I deny. We are no party: we only consist of men of all parties, who believe in the Church's life: evangelicals and orthodox alike have argued for the revival of Convocation. Their common feature was that they believed in the Church's life.' The Bishop does not say that the Convocationists exhaust the class of those who believe in the Church's life; he does not say, what Dr. Maitland wishes him to say, that they who oppose the revival of Convocation do not believe in the Church's life: he only says that they who advocate it do believe in it. Dr. Maitland says,—'Here is a plain line of demarcation.' How so? I drive none but bay horses: is this equivalent to saying, Everybody else's horses are grey? Dr. Maitland goes on to meet the Bishop's reply to the argument 'that councils are mischievous, because ecclesiastical history proves that they have ever ministered to strife,' by saying that 'he does not know who made the objection.' We answer: Dr. McCaul, among others. Dr. Maitland then proceeds, with that pleasant, brilliant, and airy tone which is so characteristic of him, to criticise the Bishop's Charge, and to suggest that either Convocation is to be a very great, and, therefore, mischievous thing, or a mere mockery and a sham. It occurs to us to confront Dr. Maitland himself with the same sort of teasing ingenuity. He also suggests a long list of *gravamina*—they are Mr. Kempthorne's—on patronage, discipline, the revision of the Prayer Book, false doctrines, clerical education, internal union, comprehension of Dissenters, and the rest, pp. 14, 15. And then Dr. Maitland proceeds to say,—'Is your Convocation going to take up all these subjects, or not? If so, when and how? and how is all this secret purpose connected with your thin edge of the wedge?—your "adaptation of services," and your "criminous clerks bill?"' To which we answer—What is your opinion, Dr. Maitland, on all these subjects? You are prudently silent: you reserve the question. You also specify 'dilapidations' as a serious and imminent

evil: what is your opinion about discipline, and patronage, and false doctrine? It seems that if the Convocationists have a *doctrina arcani*, we may ask Dr. Maitland if he has no reserved *gravamina*, or whether he is making a clean breast of it by specifying 'dilapidations' as the sin of the Church? Let him declare his sentiments on all these points, and we are ready with our answers. We have a right to ask a censor who charges us with hypocrisy and rancour, and double dealing, to be plain-spoken himself. We say, then, is Mr. Kempthorne's list of grievances a real one? If so, how does Dr. Maitland propose to deal with them? Does he think that under the present system of things a remedy is likely to present itself? If not, what else? The Bishop of Oxford has suggested Convocation; Dr. Maitland will have none of it. What will he have? For ourselves we must say that the merely critical, destructive, contradictory, negative method of dealing with Church difficulties, such as Dr. Maitland has pursued in this—like all his publications—very clever pamphlet, is little likely to attract the sympathy of any party in the Church, except that disreputable one with which it would be a libel to associate Dr. Maitland.

On the Marriage Question, we have received, since our own article was in type, a pamphlet by Mr. F. Newman Rogers, 'An Attempt to discover the true Scriptural Argument in the question of Marriage with a Wife's Sister.' (Rivingtons.) Mr. Rogers is by no means in accord with our own arguments: he will not endure the least submission to the alleged testimony of the Church; and with reference to the passages in Leviticus, he decides, somewhat peremptorily, 'that the appeal to such passages on the side of prohibition is worse than useless.'—P. 8. But after all, Mr. Rogers is very strongly opposed to the relaxation; and this on Scriptural grounds. We attach much value to his argument; because after he surrenders much more than we are disposed to relinquish, he comes to our own conclusion. He brings the case down to its simplest elements: and here he finds enough, and more than enough, on which to protest against any change. A witness of this sort has a peculiar value. He argues that the Jewish law is silent on the question, and that because it does not prescribe, it does tacitly forbid such unions. From its particular point of view, Mr. Rogers' pamphlet has a special value and interest.—We may here add that it will probably become the immediate duty of the Clergy to bring this subject before their parishes and flocks. We must certainly meet our opponents in Parliament by their own weapons: and petitions against the relaxation, that is, against Mr. Heywood's Bill, now in the House of Commons, ought to be sent in without delay. It is to be hoped that the Clergy will be on their guard against the very coarse and palpable bait which is offered in the clause relieving them from any 'action, suit, censure, or punishment,' for refusing to celebrate the proposed marriages. Scotland has already won, by the boldness of its language, the defeat of the measure as far as it is concerned: it will be the fault of the Church of England if the same energy is not displayed by our Clergy on behalf of the purity and sanctity of the domestic and social institutions of our own country.

We cannot do so much justice to Mr. Conington's able 'Inaugural Lecture,' (J. W. Parker,) delivered by him on assuming the chair of the new Latin Professorship in Oxford, as by presenting a specimen of it:—

'Those who are accustomed to a careful study of the classics, will see  
 'that I have by no means exhausted all that could fairly be said on these  
 'lines, [the first four lines of the *Æneid* ;] in other words, all that is  
 'required for a complete appreciation of them, at the same time that I have  
 'been careful not to make them mere pegs on which to hang irrelevant  
 'questions in philology or æsthetics. Yet, surely the amount of education  
 'which such a study pre-supposes or imparts is very considerable. In  
 'considering his author's general character in itself, or in contrast with  
 'that of another, the student is led to take broad views of rhetorical or  
 'poetical art; in analysing particular expressions, and disclosing the  
 'images which they involve, he is made to trace that art in its details. He  
 'has to skirt the undefined bounds which separate rhetoric from grammar,  
 'and ascertain the conditions under which words, grammatically appro-  
 'priated to one conception, can be put for those denoting another. He is  
 'frequently called to investigate grammar itself, by the occurrence of con-  
 'structions which have to be explained by some general law, or left unex-  
 'plained under the shelter of some unquestionable idiom. At other times, he  
 'will have recourse to comparative philology to illustrate a word or usage  
 'of the true nature of which the writer himself, learned as he may have  
 'been in the antiquities of his country's language, had but a dim confused  
 'consciousness. The casual allusions scattered through the work will  
 'familiarize him with much historical knowledge; the subject of the work,  
 'even though it may have no direct bearing on history, with much also.  
 'This enumeration is a very imperfect one, even as compared with my own  
 'conception and experience; yet it will be seen that it includes many of  
 'the elements which are usually held to constitute a general cultivation,  
 'thus ensuring a discipline of the various parts of the mind, more com-  
 'prehensive, probably, than can be afforded by any other single subject of  
 'knowledge. But this is not all. These several lines of thought and  
 'research are not followed for themselves, but as means to something fur-  
 'ther; they make up the method by which the truth of the writer's mean-  
 'ing is to be attained. However great their heterogeneity in relation to  
 'each other, in this point they all converge. It is difficult to secure any-  
 'thing like completeness in the method, as no man can hope to realize all the  
 'aspects in which a word or conception has appeared to the mind of an-  
 'other, especially when separated from him by a gulf of centuries; it is  
 'seldom that we can expect to make the best even of our incompleteness,  
 'as in any single track of investigation we are liable to meet with failure,  
 'or at any rate, with only partial success. Such defects, however, do not  
 'destroy the value of the results which *can* be obtained; and it only requires  
 'a careful use of the various means in our power to convince us that the  
 'method of interpretation is one that really deserves the name, leading not  
 'to specious plausibilities, but to substantial truths. I know not how it may  
 'be in the case of other sciences, but I can testify to the genuine intellectual  
 'satisfaction which the mind receives when some discovery, in itself, per-  
 'haps, of quite minor importance, a latent metaphor, a concealed imitation,  
 'the substitution of one insignificant word or inflexion of a word for another,  
 'or even the mere position of a word, hitherto overlooked, and now noticed  
 'accidentally, has flashed light on an entire passage, and a vague sense of  
 'disproportion has given place to a clear perception of harmonious sym-

'metry. Or again, where the lighting up has been not sudden, but gradual, it is not the less reassuring to recal the first aspect of a sentence, seemingly complete in itself, and sufficient to the eye of the ordinary reader, and compare it with the full appreciation which is gained at last, when every point has been accurately scrutinized, and the student once more comes to survey it as a whole. Thus the exegetical study of the classics, as it appears to me, fulfils the two great conditions of an educational instrument; it gives at once a general and a special discipline; it encourages exuberant variety of interest along with severe precision of aim. I do not say that it has always had this effect on the mind of the student, but I believe that where it has failed to do so, the fault has not been in the method, and that if even really great scholars have sometimes been narrow and one-sided, they have been so far less complete, not only as men, but as scholars. I believe also that, like all methods, it has a salutary tendency to equalize human capacities, so that though the greatest reward will always fall to his lot who, having the greatest natural powers, economises them most prudently, and disposes them to the best advantage, there will yet be an abundant harvest which inferior minds are certain to reap, by the mere fact of their honest compliance with prescribed rules; while those who go out in their own strength, disdaining all labour that appears uncongenial, find for the most part barrenness and comparative scarcity.'

Mr. C. J. Ellicott, in his edition of the 'Epistle to the Galatians,' (J. W. Parker,) has done very much to retrieve the character of English scholarship. It consists of a literal and grammatical commentary, together with a revised translation. We must pronounce it to be a work of a very high order, of sound learning, extensive research, and excellent principles. Mr. Ellicott has availed himself much more than his predecessors or contemporaries have done of continental researches: less adequately, we think, of patristic literature, especially of S. Augustine. The revised translation we are not asked, we suppose, to receive under any other form than that of an indirect commentary. In this aspect it has great value, as presenting an exegetical whole, in which the argument may stand out clearly; otherwise we should demur at some of the phraseology, which has, we think, too modern an aspect. *Ex. grat.* in enumerating the works of the Spirit, v. 20, Mr. Ellicott translates *ἐπιδόξαι*, 'caballings': this may be a fair illustration, but the political and very recent origin of the word, a mere anagram, makes it admirably unsuitable as a translation of Scripture: *αἰφύριος* is translated, and we think inadequately, in the same passage 'factions.'

Bishop Ken's 'Exposition of the Creed,' and his 'Approach to the Holy Altar,' have been beautifully reprinted in sumptuous type and published by Mr. Murray. They appear to be the labour of love of one whose 'Life of Ken' the author has illustrated both in practice and in editorial care.

Mr. F. Trench's 'Lecture delivered at Reading, on Conversation,' (J. W. Parker,) is a pleasant little brochure. The writer means to be reverent, and is to our mind much the reverse, when, by way of a 'tag' to his dis-

cussion, one ranging over social relations exclusively, he refers to our Lord's conversations—which were simple revelations, from the most sacred source—with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman.

Mr. John David Chambers, in his republication of Thorndike's 'Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,' (Masters,) has done a permanent service to the Church. Directly, the publication has only a temporary value, in relation to Archdeacon Denison's late case; but the body of notes which Mr. Chambers has selected and arranged, has a permanent and technical importance. So skilfully is the catena set out, that it becomes a conspectus of Anglican doctrine on the subject; and, as such, we thank the compiler for it,—thanks not the less sincere because he has made a stumble, at starting, in speaking, in his preface, of Sir George Wheler and William Law as laymen.—Of considerable value, also, is a catena of authorities on the same subject, published by J. H. Parker, 'The Doctrine of the Real Presence, Part I.,' which it is known was drawn up by Dr. Wright. It is curious, as containing extracts from an extraordinary and forgotten poem—Dr. Beaumont's 'Psyche.'—Mr. Grueber's excellent analysis of the Twenty-ninth Article, which we spoke of in our last number, has been published in pamphlet form by Masters.

'The First Five Years of the House of Mercy, Clewer,' by Mr. T. T. Carter, (Masters,) is a sign of the times. It shows what earnest patience may do, and it displays the blessing attendant on the day of small things. Here is a work now coincident with the Church of England, spreading on all sides, accepted on all hands, of the plainest necessity, yet from its nature difficult and even dangerous: a neglected duty, entirely neglected, yet, as it seems, entirely retrieved. And why should not this be an omen of future successes in other directions? That we have had any share in this good work, is one of the very few consolations attendant upon our duties as a public organ.

Mr. Arthur Stanley's 'Historical Memorials of Canterbury,' (Murray;) four essays on, 1. the Landing of S. Augustine; 2. the Murder of Becket; 3. Edward the Black Prince; and 4. Becket's Shrine, make a very interesting volume. Some of the Essays have been published before; altogether they exhibit an unusually attractive specimen of a sympathizing criticism, combined with original and conscientious research.

Mr. Charles Marriott's Sermon, 'The Unity of the Spirit,' (Masson,) preached for the Patriotic Fund, deserves special commendation.—Mr. Harvey's 'Suspense,' (Groombridge,) preached at Hornsey, is in a nice tone.

'Elements of a Plan for the Liquidation of the Public Debt.' (Longman.) These Essays, the first of which was published in the year 1819, were written with the sole view of harmonizing daily life with the precepts of the Gospel, by poising the political action of society on the basis of justice. Some of them have appeared in a curious work, called 'Postulates and Data.' The demonstration attempted throughout is, the dependence of the



individual, whatever may be his social condition, upon the due consideration of the rights and position of his neighbour, and the well-being of the body politic upon sound civilization; and that each and all must have a direct regard to the dictates of truth and justice, or the law of righteousness will not be fulfilled. Such has been the impelling motive to intense thought and severe application on the author's part during the progress of a life now extended to eighty years. Without committing ourselves to all his speculations, we may call attention to the sincerity and right-mindedness of his purpose. It is rare to find political disquisitions addressed solely as an endeavour to bring the purest morals to bear upon the regulation and adjustment of our social duties, as a corollary from the first and higher duty, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,' the spring and source of all happiness, present and future. Mr. Heathfield considers that what is called the Peel policy has led to the great prosperity now enjoyed throughout the empire; and as this prosperity is coincident with the development of principles essentially just and beneficent in operation, and which in act and deed reflect the light of truth, and, in as far as they be just, make manifest the wisdom which is from above, social justice—or righteousness, so reduced to practice, and not preserved in theory only—cannot be a scheme unfit for the consideration or, if need be, the cooperation of the minister of the Gospel. He instances the case of clandestine trade, and especially that of the Clergyman—in a parish of notorious smugglers.

Mr. Henry Drummond's 'Reply to the Rev. R. J. Wilberforce's Principles of Church Authority,' (Bosworth,) is as vigorous as we should expect everything to be which proceeded from his pen. Had he confined himself to the destructive portion of his work, his book would have been very telling: but the constructive parts take off the force of the others. When we find ourselves referred to government by Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, and Pastors, as the instrument for preserving unity in the Church, our feeling is rather that of *incredulus odi* than of conviction. We give two or three extracts, as specimens of his style:—'The Bishops of the Roman sect act like Railway-directors, tell all to get into the carriages, not to trouble themselves about the generation and condensation of steam, the probabilities of accidents, or any other contingencies; but to have faith that somehow or other they will arrive at their journey's end.'—P. 144. 'The most extraordinary assertion on this page 91, is, that "through the ministry of the Bishops the Apostles still sit upon Twelve Thrones judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel." First: the Apostles are in their graves, and not sitting upon thrones anywhere. Secondly: there are no thrones to sit upon until the restoration of the kingdom of Israel. Thirdly: the Bishops exercise no authority over the Twelve Tribes of Israel, although the Popes for many centuries past have treated and continue to treat all the Jews who are resident in Rome with brutal barbarity.'—P. 54. 'In p. 50 he says, "The members of Christ answer to the seed of Adam: Christ is incarnate in history because he was incarnate in His flesh." Again in p. 66 he says, "In this work" (*i.e.* building the Church), "the

'Apostle had borne the first labours, and through them did He, whom they 'had seen incarnate in the flesh, become mystically incarnate in the congregation.' Incarnation in history, is neither more nor less than rank nonsense. Incarnation in the congregation is the same. God uniting 'human flesh to himself, so that God and man are united in one Person, is Incarnation; and to nothing else in heaven or in earth is the 'word applicable.'—P. 41. He has pointed out some incorrect theological statements on the part of Mr. Wilberforce, and several historical misrepresentations. He has himself made a confusion between 'Froude's Remains' and his brother's 'Nemesis of Faith.' (P. 181.) The latter part of the book consists of a history of the iniquities of the Popes from the Tenth to Sixteenth century, related often in the very words of the ancient authorities. But Mr. Drummond does not confine himself to attacking the popes: *more suo*, he strikes a blow at every one as he passes along. But we cannot dismiss Mr. Drummond without a word of special remonstrance. Mr. Drummond has, we believe, according to his distinct convictions, a solemn and awful office in this, the Church of Christ. No matter to us what Mr. Drummond believes to be the Church. The more he disparages the rest of the brethren, the more he ought to estimate the Saviour's home in his own conventicle; the more he ought to be careful of speech and language, as himself the almost solitary sharer of the great secret and purpose of the Most High. Just as much as he vilifies us ought he to respect himself; if, as he tells us, p. 141, 'it is true of all Christendom that there is no church, no body, no temple, no kingdom, no army of Christ's; that there is [*sic*] in all the sects of Christendom many individual 'believers, but that is not a church,' &c. &c.; 'if all that we are told 'about the body of Christ and the indwelling Spirit has no sense, nor 'meaning, nor practical operation, but amongst a set of people despised by 'all, amongst whom, nevertheless, God is preparing a body throughout 'Christendom which shall shortly be translated to meet the Lord in the 'air;' (p. 180.)—that is to say, if there is no visible church of Christ upon earth except hidden in his own scanty religious community; and if this community is on the very point of consummating the great ingathering of the harvest of souls, how careful in speech, how pure in thought, how anxious lest unconsciously he make one of Christ's little ones to offend, should he especially be who bears his the highest office among the true believers. This, however, is Mr. Drummond's own affair: what concerns us is not whether Mr. Drummond's ordinary aspect towards English society, especially in the House of Commons, is or is not consistent with his personal claims; but we must say, that Mr. Drummond's peculiar taste in collecting together, and copying out, and parading and extracting obscenities and indecencies, is a serious offence in the eyes of common decency. No doubt it is an argument which has its weight against the particular claims of the See of Rome, that its pontiffs have been men of immoral lives. But there is more than one way of stating this objection. Mr. Drummond has, in this publication, to the extent of ten pages, raked together into one hideous compost of abomination all the crimes and vices which, truly or falsely, have at various times been objected, in the coarsest language, against the Popes and Roman Clergy; and whenever Mr. Drummond writes, he

pursues this hateful subject in the same hateful way. Against this unhappy habit of mind we protest. On minor points we know that a remonstrance would be useless: otherwise it were tempting to inquire what right, moral or other, the mystagogues of Gordon Square have to complain of the assumption by others of 'priestly power?' or why the devotees of the most extravagant and pedantic ritualism in existence, should affect to scorn questions about altars and surplices, lights and flowers in churches, and the like?

The 'Californian Crusoe,' (J. H. Parker,) is much better as regards purpose than execution. We consider it overcharged, and at the same time dull. If there is any evidence for connecting the Jesuits with Mormonism, let it be produced. But so serious a charge ought not to be embodied in a fictitious narrative merely to give zest to a tedious narrative.

'Leonard and Dennis,' (Masters,) 'a Tale of the present War,' is rather a collection of tales; at least, the various plots seem to have a very slight connexion. It exhibits some strong and effective writing, but little dramatic skill.

'Mother and Son, a Tale,' (J. W. Parker,) is clever and forcibly written. It is the first specimen of a series, 'Tales for the People,' and owns the authorship, we believe, of Mr. Paget. Its successor, 'The Strike,' is common-place.

Miss Sophia Brooks has printed 'Twenty-one Verses, recommending Boys' Borough Schools upon a more extensive scale.' (Palmer.) As a curiosity in more ways than one, we extract some of these verses. The boys are to be taught—

'To learn about the fields,' the herds of kine and sheep,  
From books of simple husbandry, for future labour mete;  
The names of tools of husbandry, and uses if they can:  
The lad who daily goes to school must strive to be a man.

'Must learn to fully know each varied sort of wood;  
This tends to what is great, and real essential good;  
For carpenters and shipbuilders ne'er failing to agree,  
The ship or floor to have been once a sturdy forest tree.

'The rudiments of gard'ning could amply here be taught,  
It draws the mind towards fresher scenes, of finer active thought:  
The time, the proper time, to sow each vegetable seed,  
The time to prune the branches in, lest a hasty lop recede.

'The properties and qualities, of iron, tin, and lead,  
Before the sight of ruder youth could easily be spread;  
Because too soon they oft get sent apprentice lads to be:  
'Tis neither wise, nor is it kind to sow perplexity.

'With sorrow let us speak of the reckless use of steam;  
You catch a whizzing sound, and then a fever scream.  
Oh! for visions less distracting, and needs be less appalling,  
Than human brains destroy'd, and mangl'd bodies falling.

- \* O, learn of colours light, of triple kinds of gasses;  
Learn how to use the dye, to clean the knighthood sashes;  
Slate quarries and coal mines, could rouse a vacant mind,  
And fit it to endure, work of a heavier kind.
- \* Most growing children need health in the midst of rule!  
As growing infants will, and exercise in school;  
A run or skip at morn and eve, could easily be found,  
If added to the Borough School a copious yard or ground.
- \* A large and full height school, with water well supplied;  
Not costly all without, and artificial pomp inside:  
But that which must be had, have in sufficient store;  
Pens, books, slates, ink, and over-funds for whatsoever more.'

Pp. 13—15.

'Compline, after the Use of Sarum,' (Hayes,) is a useful manual for private use, taken from authentic sources.

Cardinal Wiseman's 'Fabiola, a Tale of the Catacombs,' (Burns & Lambert,) is a touching tale, exhibiting great skill in composition, and consummate knowledge in the history of the Primitive Church. The monuments and life of the early Church are exhibited in a story of deep pathos: and, as it is written in accordance with the doctrine of development, there is scarcely anything inconsistent with the convictions of an English Churchman in the volume.

'The Palace,' (Bosworth,) is a little brochure—from internal evidence we pronounce it to be by Mr. White, a clever architect of the day—which contains, in the shape of the writer's impressions on the opening of the Crystal Palace, some careful hints on the subject of colour. Mr. White has a theory—some will call it a crotchet—on the proportions of buildings. In the Crystal Palace he finds a multiple of some number. This is true of every shed. He observes that 'there is *historical evidence* of the Egyptian artists, at least, having set out all their work by squares.' There is pictorial, and in this sense historical, evidence that Egyptian draftsmen, in copying a design, used a ground-plan of lines intersecting each other into equal squares; which is exactly what engravers and copyists do in reproducing a picture at the present day. But the process is merely mechanical, and founded upon no laws of proportion.

Bishop Selwyn's 'Four University Sermons,' (Macmillan,) only require an acknowledgment at our hands. They are, we are convinced, in the possession and in the hearts of all our readers.

In 'English: Past and Present,' (J. W. Parker,) we are presented with a brief yet interesting set of five Lectures, not very consecutive, on the changes of the English language, the elements of which it is composed, and certain of its archaisms, and the secondary and derived senses of words. These Lectures were delivered to Mr. Trench's class in King's College, and exhibit much information in philology and etymology, not drily put, but illustrated by the author's elegant and multifarious reading. These

are studies which very much interest the young; the unexpectedness of the derivation of a word, and its lurking affinities of meaning, seem to attract those mental faculties which in childhood are applied to games of chance and puzzles. This little work must be read in connexion with the writer's previous publication, 'On the Study of Words.'

'The Seven Ages of a Christian's Life, (Rivingtons,) is a meditation of a very common-place character, on the different stages of human life, connected, in some way which we are unable to discover, with Shakspeare's Seven Ages. It is by the Dean of Norwich. Speaking of youth, Dr. Pellew observes (p. 11),—'The Church justly concludes, that at the age of fifteen or sixteen years the children of Christian parents become . . . entitled to a nearer approach, &c. after receiving the holy rite of confirmation.' We are unable to discover this conclusion of the Church. The Church requires children to be confirmed, as soon as they can say three short formularies; and although this order is by some of our Bishops construed to mean at the age of sixteen, yet the construction is a very recent one. Nicholas Ferrar was confirmed at the age of six years; and, as we find from Bishops Hacket and Taylor, it was the custom of those days to admit children at a very early age to confirmation and communion.

A second edition of 'Lent Readings from the Fathers,' (J. H. Parker,) compiled by Mr. Bennett, and recommended by Dr. Pusey, will, perhaps, if ever reasonably read, teach gainsayers what depths of spiritual and practical religion are to be found in writings which they are disposed only from ignorance to condemn and disparage.

Of a like tendency,—that is, to simple edification,—we welcome Mr. H. Dunwell's 'Lectures on the Psalms.' (J. H. Parker.) They are composed chiefly of the thoughts and running commentaries of S. Augustine, and the early Fathers: and they embrace the first twenty-four Psalms, the xlv. and cx. By the way, Theodoret has no claim to the title of Saint.

'The Golden Spell, and other Poems.' (Exeter: Holden.) This collection has reached a second edition, and exhibits considerable thought. The writer would, we think, do well to cultivate simplicity: there is a depth of meaning in many of his poems which exhausts the attention, and we are free to confess that we cannot always fathom him. He composes on a theory, which, if we are sometimes unable to appreciate,—perhaps we had better say, to understand,—we can award him our conviction that it has enabled him to give us a volume which is on the whole of high promise.

Dr. Townsend, of Durham, has taken some pains to accomplish a work which some of our readers may believe might as well have been left undone. In his 'Flowers from the Garden of the Church,' (J. H. Parker,) he has turned all the Prayer Book Collects into verse. We suppose there is something in the air of Durham which makes this sort of ingenious labour indigenous. Sir George Wheler, who turned the English Communion office into heroic verse, &c. was a prebendary of Durham; and Dr. Tye, the organist, who did 'the Acts of the Apostles into English metre,' was, we think, connected with the same church.

The third, and, as it turns out, the concluding part of the work, undertaken, we believe, by Mr. Isaac Taylor, 'The Restoration of Belief,' (Macmillan,) has appeared. It hurries to a conclusion; and presses as a summary argument against modern infidelity, the argument from the Miracles. It confronts unbelief, changing as it is in character and vacillating in purpose, on a single issue, that of the Miracles of the Gospel. The present writer does not consider the argument from the Miracles in its common aspect, as a mere series of supernatural events, isolated in their purpose, and un consequential beyond a single object, that of 'launching a new religion in the world, and for giving it an initial impulse' on its first and unwilling hearers; but he considers that the Miracles have a permanent and prolonged purpose, and have special and eternal relations with all the objects of the scheme of salvation. Superficial readers might, and not unreasonably, be alarmed at the somewhat meagre enumeration of these objects of the Saviour's mission, in which that of propitiation for sin and His sacrifice as a vicarious atonement, appears to hold a very ill-defined if even a palpable position. But Mr. Taylor's object must be borne in mind: he takes up disbelief at its own account of itself; and at p. 318, he plainly professes his distinct belief in all the articles of the Nicene Creed. We do not share in the writer's anticipations, but his view has not often been better expressed than in these words:—

'I look forward to a time when national distinctions of race, language, and geographical location shall continually be melting away, at least so far as they may ultimately be obstructive of the brotherhood of the human family. That centralization—apart from universal *empire*—which a true understanding of the conditions of social well-being tends to bring about, and which it is now in the course of bringing about, is, I think, embraced or implied throughout the prophetic writings. On the same grounds I look for a future time when Right for the many, or, better expressed, when RIGHT for ALL, shall be the sovereign and irresistible principle in every community. As to Right for the *many*, it has taken to itself a conventional meaning, which differs little, if at all, from a periodic overthrow of society, such as may give the undermost class their time of plunder. But RIGHT for ALL, means social *stability*; and this one idea of STABILITY, as opposed to anarchy and to periodic convulsions, meets us everywhere on the prophetic pages. Then, as the consequence of this my first anticipation, I look for a time when the material welfare, or, as we say, the earthly and daily comfort and enjoyment of the many—or let us rather say of all, so that we may exclude that banditti meaning which radicalism clings to—when this well-doing for all—this secure holding of the most needful things of life, shall be so much thought of as shall in fact realize it in a continually more and more complete manner. Between the two cooperative influences of an iron sense of right and justice on the one hand, and of humanizing and soft-hearted sympathies on the other, an intense feeling shall pervade the social mass, under the operation of which, want—still incident as it must be to man—and squalor, and houseless discomfort, and, what is worse, cellared wretchedness, and disease—the child of filth shall always be in process of sublimation, and shall be driven off, as one may say, from the social mass, by its high internal



'temperature. A strong feeling of uneasiness at the sight or thought of  
'privation and bodily misery shall be always ridding the world of these  
'ever-recurrent evils. I look for a time, not fabulous and impossible—not  
'rosy and celestial, but earthlike and sunny, when every man—absolutely  
'secure from violence, and moderately at ease, shall sit in home style  
'under, or near to, as he likes best, his vine and fig-tree, none daring, or  
'even wishing, to make him afraid. I do not look for a time on this earth  
'when there shall be no surgeons' work—no hospitals, no infirmaries, no  
'police; but I do believe in an age of individual and domestic bliss, such  
'as is pictured in some sweet odes and stirring paragraphs of my Bible.  
'I believe in a time yet to come, when HE who—eternal shame upon  
'Manichees, upon Ascetics, upon Fanatics of all sorts—"manifested His  
'glory" first, by being a willing guest at a wedding, and then and there  
'showing that Creation is His own—when HE shall bless the world by  
'bringing at once His iron sceptre of righteousness and His law of love  
'to bear upon the *temporal* good of all men. I look for a time when HE  
'who is "King of Peace" and "King of Righteousness," shall rule the  
'nations under both titles; and when, as a consequence of the establish-  
'ment of uncontradicted Truth and of Reason, safe from sophistry, and of  
'Right, bowed to and enforced, there shall be abundance of earthly felicity,  
'to last until this planet has wound up its destined story.

'In the course of those events that have marked the years of this cur-  
'rent century—that is to say, those *ostensible* matters which history takes  
'account of—I scarcely discern any indications of the coming on of such  
'an era of mundane welfare. One may imagine, to-day, that things are  
'taking a turn in this better direction; but to-morrow (as so many past  
'to-morrows have done) will perhaps scatter every supposition of the sort,  
'and break it up as a dream. But though the evolving fortunes of  
'nations do not clearly, if at all, foreshow the golden age at hand, yet it is  
'true that those who have been watching the unrecorded movements of  
'the human mind—in Europe, throughout these fifty years, and who have  
'been used to let down a line into the under-current, and have noted its  
'shiftings, have come to think that those preparations—intellectual, moral,  
'and political—which would be the proper precursors of a new and better  
'era, have not only had a commencement, but have been making progress  
'at a rapid rate.'—Pp. 208—311.

Here, too, is a fine passage on the belief in the Resurrection from the  
dead:—

'In the first place then, an unhesitating belief of the resurrection of  
'Christ—if I allow the mediative faculty to dwell upon it—leads me forth  
'from a region of interminable surmises that are comfortless, appalling, or  
'worse; and it brings me upon a ground that is firm to the foot, and  
'where those objects that are already familiar to me, stand out distinctly,  
'and are sharply defined; and they show themselves, not in the glimmer  
'or in the blaze of a vague phosphorescence, but in the every-day sober sun-  
'light of this present world. If I carry myself back, as I may easily do,  
'to that Garden under the walls of Jerusalem wherein was a sepulchre, or  
'enter an upper chamber, within the city, or go on to a house a Sabbath-

'day's journey, south of it; or travel so far as to the shore of the lake of Galilee; if I go thither taking with me no haze of exaggeration, I there find HIM who is at once the Representative of the human family, and its Sponsor; and I find Him such after the suffering of death, as He was before it—save his recent scars. The immortality, therefore, which is held before me in the Christian scheme, is no such a thing as a nucleus of conscious mist, floating about in a golden fog, amid millions of the same purposeless, limbless sparks. It is an immortality of organized material energies;—it is the same welded mind-and-matter human nature—fitted for service—apt to labour, and capable of all those experiences, and furnished for all those enterprises, and armed for those endurances, which, seeing that they are thus provided for, and are, as one may say, thus foreshown in the Christian resurrection, put before me a rational solution—hypothetic indeed, and yet not illusory—of those now immanent trials, of those hard experiences, of those frustrated labours, and of those fiery sufferings, the passing through which so much perplexes and disheartens me now; but which at once find their reason when I see them in their intention, as the needed schooling for an immortality in the endless fortunes of which this mind-and-matter structure shall have room to show what things it can do and bear, and what enterprises of love it shall devise, and shall bring to a happy consummation, it may be, cycles of centuries hence.

"The Lord is risen indeed!" said those simple souls, one to another, in that dim morning hour—which was the morning of a Day Eternal to human nature; and He so rises as to throw forward upon the path of this human nature, to the remotest range of an endless existence, a steady light of reality.

Over against this reasonable and conceivable CHRISTIAN IDEA of the future life, as it is set before me in the instance of the Resurrection of Christ, I will put the dreamy Elysium of classical antiquity—I will put the sensualisms of the oriental beliefs—I will put the wearisome and vapid inanities of modern poetical or philosophical surmises:—yes, and over against this genuine belief I must put those more consistent suppositions which, at this present time, are presenting themselves, in a whisper, as probable, if we are to follow the guidance of psychological speculation, and if we are looking to such a future existence as the analogy of things around us might suggest. As compared with all such anticipations—more or less consonant as they may severally be with facts known to us—I find that my Christian Belief is more consistent than any one of them, is more realizable—is more cheering, is more animating, and that it is of a tendency (when rightly considered) the most healthful, as to the moral and the intellectual faculties.—Pp. 341—344.

In some respects on the same subject, but with less of a philosophic spirit, and yet with considerable practical shrewdness and plainness of speech and language, Mr. R. W. Morgan publishes his 'Christianity and Modern Infidelity compared.' (Rivingtons.) Mr. Morgan, we think, had better have avoided the dialogue form, which Mr. Rogers, in his celebrated 'Eclipse of Faith,' has treated with such skill. In Mr Morgan's hands,

the dialogue is not conducted with that deep Socratic irony which refutes an opponent by his own admissions, and which compels his reluctant witness to the truth. 'The Infidel' in Mr. Morgan's book only stands up to put his worst and most assailable arguments. However, Mr. Morgan writes in a clear and popular way; and his arguments are always intelligibly and intelligently put. His own principles are sound; and for general purposes he has furnished a useful manual, which is highly creditable to his argumentative powers. — From the same writer we have received two other publications—we decline to specify them—one relating to his own grievances and alleged wrongs; the other consisting of a very stirring appeal against the sins and errors of the administration of the Church in Wales. Whether the latter protest is not the result of Mr. Morgan's own position we shall not here say; and with respect to his case we must decline to give an opinion on an *ex parte* statement. This much, however, we can afford to say,—that the state of things which permits either the charge made by Mr. Morgan, or the charge made against Mr. Morgan, to stand as it appears to stand, merely as a charge uninvestigated, and therefore of course unrefuted, is the heaviest possible censure of that system of clerical discipline which Dr. Maitland is so surprised that we are Quixotic enough to think that even a body so ineffective as Convocation might mend; or at least try to mend.

It is not often that we see the sermons of English Churchmen in French. We have, however, had forwarded to us a very good French Sermon on the Conversion of Zachæus, by the Rev. F. Godfray. It was first printed in 'L'Ami de la Religion, ou, Messager Evangélique des Iles de la Manche,' (Jersey: Gosset; London: Masters,) which we have already taken occasion to commend.

Mr. Claude Magnay has published a volume of Sermons, (Masters,) which he designates as 'Practical and Suggestive.' All that they suggest to us is the question, why they were printed. As we looked through the volume we had hopes of the writer: the Sermons are certainly not so bad as the Preface.

Mr. Harvey Goodwin's 'Four University Sermons,' delivered during the present spring, (Deighton,) make us thankful that such really sound and impressive cautions should be addressed to undergraduates from a Cambridge pulpit. This is the valuable part of the sermons: in their doctrinal aspect we see, or fancy that we see, the amiable object of conciliation somewhat overruling the sterner and more rigid duties of the preacher. It is with something like *naïveté* that on one occasion Mr. Goodwin expresses great surprise that, with reference to some of his speculations on the Temptation, 'no trace of it is to be found in such of the Fathers as I have been able to consult.'—P. 146. Mr. Goodwin, however, falls back on the countenance which his views receive from Mr. Farmer, a dissenting minister, and a pupil of Dr. Doddridge. We are surprised, in the fourth Sermon, to find the preacher arguing that the petition in the Litany, 'In all time of our wealth,' referred to 'temptations from being rich in silver and gold.'

A single sermon, of considerable power, 'The Year that King Ahaz died,' (Rivingtons,) is by Professor Claughton, and puts very nicely the social and political, and therefore the religious, lesson to be drawn from the death of the Emperor Nicholas.

A set of 'Practical Sermons,' published by Masters, on the Old Testament Saints, we can speak of with entire approval. The sermons on Scripture characters have, and very undeservedly, been too much lost sight of.

A series of 'Papers and Sermons on the War,' (Rivingtons,) is in course of publication. 'A Manual of Prayers for the Wounded'—'Sermon to the Wounded'—'Sermon to the Dying'—'Sermon to those at Home,' are before us, and we can speak highly of them. With all the complaints which are urged, and too often, we believe, for selfish and party purposes, our conviction is that no British, or any other Christian, army ever went upon active service so amply provided with temporal and spiritual appliances as that now serving in the Crimea; and therefore no war has been conducted under auspices so hopeful.

---

# INDEX TO VOL. XXIX.

(NEW SERIES.)

## ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

### C.

Cathedral Reform [*Commissioners' Report, &c.*], 332—368. Exclusive interest attached to parochial Clergy, 332. Estimate of capitular property, 333. The Ecclesiastical Commission, 1835, 334. History of the Cathedrals, 335. Chapters, 339. At the Reformation, 343. Reform, so called, of 1835, 344. Present needs and prospects, 344—368.

Clergy, Education of the [*Report of Cathedral Commissioners, &c.*], 192—214. Diocesan Colleges, 192. Work expected of the Universities, 193. Dr. Heurtley, 193. Dr. Ogilvie, 194. University lectures, 196. Paries in the Church, 198. Separate Classes, 202. Wells College, 205. Education wanted for Students in Theology apart from the University, 207—214.

### D.

De Quincey [*Selections, &c.*], 155—191. Autobiography, 155. Of infancy, 156. The Author's style, 157. De Quincey's childhood, 158. His sister, 160. His brother, 163—166. Boyhood, 169. At school, 171. The world, 172. London, 174, 175. The author at fifteen, 177. Lady Carbery, 178. The writer's character, 180—183. Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge, 174—191.

Dury, Calixtus, and the Peacemakers [*Calixtus und seine Zeit, &c.*], 1—49. Syncretism, 2. State of Germany, 3. Of the Lutherans, 4—6. Calixtus, 7. External aspect of Lutherans, 8; in Sweden, 9; and elsewhere, 10, 11. The Feast of the Reformation, 12. The Lutheran fast days, 13. The Reformed, 14. Dury, 15—29. Calixtus, 29—43. Other attempts at pacification, 46—49.

NO. LXXXVIII.—N.S.

### F.

Faber, George Stanley, [*Many Mansions, &c.*], 310—331. A controversialist, 311. His birth, 312. His career at Oxford, 313. Marriage, 314. He is ordained, 315. Preferment, 315. Sherburn Hospital, 316. His character, 317; and literary tastes, 318. His illness and death, 320, 321. His theology, 322. His "Many Mansions," 324—331.

### M.

Mahometanism [*Möhter on Islam, &c.*], 83—154. Increasing interest on the subject, 83. Classical writers on the subject, 84. Other authorities, 85—87. Möhter, 88. Caussin, 89. Ubcini, 90. Dr. Newman, 91—93. State of Arabia at the era of Mahomet, 94. Arab characteristics, 95—105. Anticipations of Mahometanism, 106. Life of Mahomet, 107. Was he an impostor? 108—113. Möhter's view, 114, 115. Character of his religion, 116—154.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister [*Letters by Dr. Hessey, Messrs. Beresford Hope, Keble, &c.*], 458—477. Argument from Scripture, 458. Sense of Levit. xviii. 7—17, 459—467. Table of prohibited Degrees, 468. The testimony of the Ancient Church, 470—472. Maimonides, 473. Conclusion, 475—477.

### O.

Ottomans, the early [*Von Hammer's History of the Ottomans, &c.*], 225—309. Present interest in the Ottomans, 225, 226. Von Hammer, 227. His French translator, 228. The Turkomans, 229. Family of Seljouk, 230. Othman, 232—238. Orchan, 239—247. The

M M

Janissaries, 248—254. Orchan's reign and death, 255—258. Amurath, 259—269. Bajazet, 270. Battle of Nicopolis, 271—273. Reign of Bajazet, 274—277. Timour, 278. Battle of Angora, 279. Bajazet, a prisoner, dies, 283. Sons of Bajazet and disputed succession, 288. Revival of the Ottoman power under Mahomet, 286—288. Amurath II., 289—302. Mahomet the Conqueror, 302. Fall of Constantinople, 303—309.

## P.

Plurality of Worlds [*An Essay, &c. Answer by Sir D. Brewster, &c.*], 50—82. Dr. Whewell, the author, 50. The reply, 52. Position of the Earth in the Universe, 54—60. Analysis

of Dr. Whewell's work, 61—77. Sir D. Brewster's Work, 78—80. Conclusion, 81, 82.

## W.

Wilberforce on the Supremacy [*Inquiry into the Principles of Church-authority, &c.*], 369—457. No novelty in Mr. Wilberforce's work, 369. Its bitter spirit, 370. Church authority, 371. Councils, 372. Mr. Wilberforce's four propositions, 373. Was S. Peter, by Divine appointment, the centre of unity? 374—403. Was the Bishop of Rome the centre of unity to the early Church? 404—417. Was the Primacy a Supremacy? 418—443. The position of the English Church at the Reformation, 444—452. The Greek Church, 453, 454. Conclusion, 455—457.



## SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

**JANUARY.**—Early History of the Primacy of Armagh—Heartsease, or, the Brother's Wife—Letter to Mr. Dale—Bishop of Winchester on Convocation—Educational Prospects of S. Thomas, Charterhouse—Truths Maintained—The Church and her Destinies—The Castle Builders—Recent Forms of Prayer—Professor Ansted's Scenery, Science, and Artist—Baker's Northamptonshire Glossary—Late Payment of Weekly Wages—Murray's Railway Reading—Bishop of Oxford's Charge—Classic Texts—Stories and Lessons on the Catechism—Analysis of the Revelation—Archdeacon Denison's Statement of his Case—Grueber on Art. XXIX.—Gresley on the Unity of the Church—Wilberforce on the Royal Supremacy—Newland's 'Postils'—Meyrick's Two University Sermons.

**APRIL.**—Ramsay's Catechisms—Newland's Norway—Public Nurseries—Instrumenta Ecclesiastica—Parker's Scripture Prints—Journal of Philology—Calvin's Letters—Mulready's Vicar of Wakefield—Goodwin's Guide to the Parish Church—Harvey on the Creeds—Procter on the Common Prayer—Hill's Letter to Dr. Barrow—The Cross and the Dragon—Freeman on the Church Services—Work for National Schools—Poems on the War—Burgon's Memorial of Dr. Routh

—Arnold's Horace—Richard's Champion—Heathcote on the Catechism—Hawkins' Family Prayers—Marriott's Poems—Barrett's Latin Grammar—Sharpe on the Bible—Life of Nicholas Ferrar—On the Holy Communion—Apology for Secular Recreations—Sermon on Immaculate Conception—Convocation and Church Services—New Edition of Hume and Smollett—Month in Portugal—Whately's Thoughts—Observance of Sunday—Foulkes' Pamphlet—Old Church Porch—Schnorr's Bible Prints—French Architectural Dictionary—Maitland on Convocation—Church Thoughts—Rogers on Marriage Question—Conington's Inaugural Lecture—Ellicott on the Galatians—Ken on the Creed—Trench on Conversation—Thorndike on the Eucharist—Wright's Catena—Clewes House of Mercy—Memorials of Canterbury—Sermons by Marriott and Harvey—Heathfield's Essays—Godfray's Sermon—Drummond's Reply to Wilberforce—Californian Crusoe—Leonard and Dennis—Mother and Son—The Strike—Brooks' Verses—Sarum Compline—Fabiola—The Palace—Bishop Selwyn's Sermons—English: Past and Present—Seven Ages—Lent Readings—Dunwell on the Psalms—The Golden Spell—Townshend on the Collects—The Restoration of Belief—Morgan on Infidelity—Sermons by Godfray, Magnay, Goodwin, Claughton—Practical Sermons—War Tracts, &c.



